REGIS COLLEGE LIBRARY
3 1761 05810351 6

CANADIAN MESSENGER
LIBRARY
Section
Number 180

THE POPE AND THE CHURCH.

PRINTED BY
JAMES STANLEY, ROEHAMPTON.

THE

POPE AND THE CHURCH

CONSIDERED IN THEIR MUTUAL RELATIONS

WITH REFERENCE TO THE

Errors of the High Church Party in England.

BX
1806
.B88
186
v.1

BY THE

REV. PAUL BOTTALLA, S.J.,

Professor of Theology in St. Beuno's College, N. Wales.

REGIS
BIBL. MAJ.
COLLEGE/

PART I.

THE SUPREME AUTHORITY OF THE POPE.

LONDON:
BURNS, OATES, AND Co., 17, PORTMAN STREET.

MDCCCLXVIII.

63849

PREFACE.

THE present work has been ready for some time past, although its publication has been unavoidably delayed. On the appearance of Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*, the writer formed the intention of giving a condensed account of the whole controversy between Catholics and the Tractarian School. Further consideration, however, convinced him that it would be better to confine himself to the two fundamental points of the entire controversy, for by these, and by these alone, can it be decided, and these once settled, all minor difficulties will speedily vanish.

Hence the subject of this treatise is the Authority and Infallibility of the Pope and Church; two crucial topics, misunderstood alike, if not equally, in every form of religion external to Catholicism; the former being concerned with the constitution of the Church itself, the latter having reference to its claims as a teacher. Now, though the High Church party, as they are called, most nearly approximate to that Church which alone is Catholic, they too share in the common error of Pro-

testants, inasmuch as the communion which they mistake for the true Church has, according to their system, no visible foundation or centre of unity, nor do they attribute to it the office of an infallible teacher, since they consider the Scriptures to be in some sense the exclusive deposit of revelation.

The truth is, that Jesus Christ founded the Church upon St. Peter and his successors—that is, upon their authority, which is supreme in ruling and infallible in instructing, and He committed His teaching to the Apostles and their successors in the Episcopate, with the object of transmitting it from one generation to another till the end of time, entire and unaltered, preserved in its integrity by the might of that Holy Spirit, who was to be with the Church for ever, and to teach it all truth. It follows, consequently, that the whole fabric of Christ's Church is held together by the Supreme Authority of the Pope, whilst Infallibility resides in the living, unerring *magisterium.*

These two points have been treated with especial reference to the errors and misconceptions of the Tractarian School. For the sake of clearness and method, the work is divided into three portions. The first, now presented to the public, has for its theme, the Supreme Authority of the Pope as centre and foundation of the whole Church. The second will treat of Papal Infallibility, and explain its intimate connection with the Church, its nature and its extent. The concluding volume will be occupied with the consideration of

Catholic teaching in its true origin and real development.

It has been the author's endeavour to assign as large a space as was practicable to the historical and other difficulties which seemingly contradict the principles laid down, and which prejudice and misrepresentation have caused so many sincere inquirers to consider quite irreconcilable with the present system of the Church. Amongst these are the refusal of St. Gregory the Great to assume or allow in others the title of "Universal Bishop," the African controversy in the fifth century, the Canons of the Council of Sardica, the well-known Twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon, the Gallican system, the Councils of Constance and Florence, the errors ascribed to Popes Liberius and Honorius, the development of doctrine, and other such questions.

Brevity and solidity have been consulted as much as possible. Thus each volume will be of a very moderate size, though each will contain a complete treatment of the matter discussed. At the same time, to prove that nothing is asserted arbitrarily, brevity has not been allowed to stand in the way of constant reference to authorities, and of frequent quotation of the documents referred to.

The author tenders no apology for faults of style. Were there none it would not be his own work, and that there are no more is owing to the kind assistance which he gratefully acknowledges. He is aware that the earnest

seeker after truth—and for such alone he writes—knowing the vital importance of the subject, will set more store upon the matter here treated than upon the dress in which it comes before him.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

(pp. 1—6.)

I. Importance of the Subject—Opinions of Mr. Palmer and of Dr. Browne in accordance with the Catholic Doctrine. II. Design of the Treatise. III. Principles of Dr. Pusey and of Anglicans generally concerning the Papacy. IV. Summary of their system.

SECTION I.

UNITY AND SUPREMACY IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

(pp. 7—29.)

I. False idea of Church Unity held by Protestants—Divine Prototypes of the Church. II. The essential character of these Prototypes—The Church centre must be numerically one. III. Close connection between Church Unity and Supremacy according to the ancient Fathers: St. Cyprian, Pope Cornelius, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome—St. Cyprian's beautiful conception of Church Unity and Papal Supremacy—St. Jerome on the same subject—St. Optatus of Milevis. IV. The doctrine was fully acknowledged by the Gallicans as a matter of faith—Terms on which Bossuet would have agreed to the union of England with Rome. V. Dr. Wake and Du Pin—Great mistake of Dr. Pusey concerning the matter. VI. Two passages of St. Cyprian misrepresented by Dr. Pusey. VII. They prove the opposite doctrine to that which he quoted them to prove. VIII. The Greek and Protestant view of Church Unity is contrary to that conveyed in the Epistles of St. Paul—It is illogical. IX. It is contrary to the view of the Scripture and of the ancient Fathers.

SECTION II.

THE DIVINE INSTITUTION OF PRIMACY IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

(pp. 29—61.)

I. Close connection of Supremacy of St. Peter with that of the Popes acknowledged by Schismatics and Protestants—Conflicting Protestant views concerning St. Matt. xvi. 18—Their common error. II. The words of St. Matthew refer to St. Peter—No other literal interpretation admissible. III. The Fathers of the first five centuries are not at variance about the meaning of St. Matthew's words—All other interpretations of the Fathers are perfectly consistent with their literal interpretation of the text, and supply its full meaning. IV. Passages in illustration. V. False interpretation of St. Matthew's words adopted by Mr. Palmer, &c. —It derives no support from the words of Tertullian—The passage of the Pseudo-Ambrose, or rather, of St. Maximus, makes against it. VI. The Catholic interpretation of the "Rock" is supported by all antiquity. VII. Supremacy of St. Peter is grounded on the passages of the Gospel, St. Matt. xvi. 19—The Fathers are unanimous as to the meaning of the texts. VIII. St. John xxi. 15—17—The title of Shepherd belongs principally to Christ—Extensive power given to St. Peter in that title. IX. Inequality of the Apostles with reference to St. Peter's Supremacy—Exceptional privileges personally granted to the Apostles.

SECTION III.

THE PAPAL SUPREMACY PROCLAIMED BY PREDECESSORS OF GREGORY I., AND BY THAT GREAT POPE HIMSELF.

(pp. 62—80.)

I. St. Gregory's declaration against the title of Œcumenical. II. The Predecessors of St. Gregory solemnly proclaimed their Supremacy *de jure divino* over the whole Church: Siricius I., Innocent I., Zosimus, Boniface I., Celestine, Sixtus III., Leo I. —Other Popes. III. St. Gregory I. held the same view on Papal Supremacy. IV. Extracts from St. Gregory's works misunderstood by Anglican critics—St. Gregory's doctrine on the Headship of the Church is that of Scripture and of all antiquity. V. Summary of his doctrine on the subject. VI. St. Gregory's teaching on the

Patriarchates affords new light and support to his doctrine of the Papal Supremacy. VII. Controversy between St. Gregory and the Patriarch of Constantinople on account of the title of "Œcumenical Bishop"—Twofold meaning of the title as referring to Order or Jurisdiction—Pope Gregory condemned it in both senses as assumed by the Bishop of Constantinople—He refuses to assume that title in the former sense—He declines it as a title of honour; but not as implying the right of Universal Jurisdiction in the Church. VIII. This new title of honour refused by the Popes out of humility and prudence.

SECTION IV.

THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE EXERCISED OVER, AND ACKNOWLEDGED BY, THE EASTERN CHURCH. CANON TWENTY-EIGHT OF CHALCEDON.

(pp. 81—109.)

I. Evidences of Papal Supremacy—Its exercise over the provinces of the East denied by Protestants, but acknowledged by the Oriental Church. II. Pope Damasus and the heresy of Apollinaris—His predecessor, Julius, had acted with the same fulness of power, claiming it as the right of the Roman See. III. Pope Celestine and St. Cyril in the cause of Nestorius—The Council of Ephesus recognises the Supreme Authority of the Pope—Declaration of the Papal Legate in the Synod. IV. Dr. Pusey, misled by a false translation of a Letter of Pope Celestine—Further proofs of the Supremacy exercised by Pope Celestine. V. Mr. Palmer on St. Leo's view of his Supremacy—His Authority *de jure divino* acknowledged by Emperors and Patriarchs; by the Council of Chalcedon—Declaration of the Papal Legates in the Synod—The Council unequivocally recognises St. Leo's Supremacy in the Church to be *de jure divino.* VI. Dr. Overbeck's groundless remark on the *Guardianship of the Vine*, which he explained by the Twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon—The history of that Canon furnishes one of the best arguments for the Papal Supremacy—Brief history and character of the Byzantine Patriarchate—Aim of the Patriarch Anatolius in framing the Twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon. VII. Words of that Canon—Its meaning may be gathered from the Third Canon of Constantinople—It favours the Papal Supremacy—This is more clearly shown by the explanation given in the Sixteenth Session of the Synod—The Council, the Patriarch, and the Emperor seek confir-

mation of the Canon from the Pope as their Superior. VIII. Pope Leo, by virtue of his divine uncontrolled authority annuls the Canon—The Canon was consequently not inserted in the authoritative Collections till the time of the schism of Photius—Sanction at length given by Innocent III., in the Fourth Council of Lateran —Reasons for the Popes' opposition till that time. IX. Dr. Pusey's alleged Papal Contradictions—True meaning of Pope Adrian's Letter proved from the Acts of the Synod of Chalcedon, and from St. Gregory's Letters—No contradiction between the Letters of Leo and St. Adrian concerning the Patriarchate of Constantinople —Historical mistake of Dr. Pusey.

SECTION V.

THE SAME INQUIRY CONTINUED DOWN TO THE SEPARATION OF THE GREEK FROM THE LATIN CHURCH. CONVERSION OF RUSSIA.

(pp. 109—137.)

I. Subject of this Section—Divine Authority exercised by the Popes over the Oriental Church: Pope Simplicius. II. Pope Felix III.—Definitive Sentence of the Pope against the Patriarch Acacius. III. Other Popes—Letter addressed to Pope Symmachus by the whole Episcopate of the East—*Relation* of 168 Oriental Clerics and Archimandrites forwarded to Pope Hormisdas—Full submission of the whole Eastern Church to the formulary of union imposed by the Pontiff—This formulary equivalent to a definition of faith. IV. Appeal of 90 Archimandrites to Pope Agapitus—Definitive deposition of Anthimus by the Pope, and appointment of Mennas—The Divine Supremacy of the Pope acknowledged by Anthimus, by Mennas, and by the Emperor Justinian I.—Pope Vigilius deposes the Bishop of Cæsarea, although protected by the Emperor—All submit to the sentence. V. St. Gregory I. exercises the same authority over the Eastern Church—Four instances in proof—Evident conclusion in favour of the Papal Supremacy—The Statutes of Pope Pelagius were the guide of St. Gregory's conduct. VI. Testimony of Stephen, Bishop of Dora, in favour of Papal Supremacy; of Sergius, Bishop of Cyprus; of St. Maximus; of the Sixth Synod; VII. of the Seventh Synod—St. Adrian's Letter to Tarasius, Archbishop of Constantinople. VIII. Beginning of the Eastern Schism—Pope Nicholas exercises his Supreme Authority against Photius—The

Emperor Basil fully submits to the definitive sentence of the Pontiff—Ignatius professes the Papal Supremacy divine, as the Eighth Œcumenical Council does the same—Photius, restored to the Patriarchal See, acknowledges the Papal Supremacy in the Synod of Constantinople—He is again deposed by the authority of the Pope—The Eastern Church acknowledges the Pope's Supreme Jurisdiction—The Schism brought about in the East through Michael Cerularius—Testimonies of the East in favour of the Papal Supremacy during the Schism. IX. Bold assertion of Dr. Pusey in this matter—His statements regarding the Conversion of the Russians refuted.

SECTION VI.

FALSE DECRETALS—AFRICAN CONTROVERSY—CANONS OF SARDICA ON APPEALS CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE.

(pp. 138—157.)

I. Erroneous views of the False Decretals—Two principal mistakes in this matter—True view of the Decretals now generally received. II. Erroneous comparison of the Schismatic Church of England with that of Africa in the time of St. Augustine—Testimony of St. Augustine—The African Church never denied the claim of the Pope to receive Appeals—True view of the African controversy: it was a disciplinary question—Totally different position of the Anglican Church. III. Erroneous view taken of the Canons of Sardica—Long before the Council of Sardica the Pope received Appeals. IV. Those Canons imply no grant of Appellate Jurisdiction—Meaning of the Fourth Canon—Of the Seventh. V. Reason why Pope Zosimus in his *Commonitorium* quoted the Seventh and Seventeenth Canons of Sardica—Submission of the African Church to the Jurisdiction of the Pope—The Canon of Carthage on Appeals does not impeach the Supreme Jurisdiction of the Pope—Character of the African controversy. VI. Further difficulties against the Pope's right to receive Appeals—The instances adduced affirm the right—Case of Basilides and Martialis—St. Cyprian plainly acknowledged the right of the Popes to receive Appeals. VII. Inconsistency of Dr. Pusey—The case cited does not imply an Appeal. VIII. Dr. Pusey confounds substance with accident, and hence draws a false inference.

SECTION VII.

GALLICANISM: ITS ORIGIN, PROGRESS, TENDENCY, AND EFFECTS.

(pp. 157—183.)

I. Partiality of Protestants for the Gallican School and its Writers—Dr. Pusey's misapprehensions with regard to Gallicanism. II. The Gallican School never departed from the fundamental Catholic doctrine as to the Divine Supremacy of the Pope—Natural tendency of Gallicanism—Historical sketch of its origin and progress. III. Pagan maxims denying ecclesiastical independence spread over Europe during the thirteenth and following centuries—Western Schism. IV. Two opinions as to healing it—Doctrines of the extreme faction—Doctrines of the moderate party—Principles on Church Authority generally received at that time. V. Irreligious tendency of the Parliaments of France—Decrees of the Pseudo-Synod of Basle—Pragmatic Sanction—It is condemned. VI. Preponderance of the Parliament of Paris, and its hostility to Papal Authority – Gallican Liberties a cloak for real oppression of the Church—Pithou. VII. Dupuy—They are condemned by the Episcopate of France, but supported by the Parliament — Progress of Schismatical doctrines in France—Judgment of De Maistre, Fleury, and Fénélon on the matter. VIII. The Gallican maxims are spread among the Clergy—They receive encouragement—The Controversy of the *Regalia* under Louis XIV.—National Assembly of 1682—Object of it—The Four Articles. IX. Their import—Bossuet, and his conduct in the Assembly—The *Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani*—Bossuet is not responsible for this publication, nor for the principles contained in it. X. The Four Articles are condemned by several Universities and Bishops; by the Popes; finally rejected by Louis XIV. and by the Clergy of France—Gallicanism and Jansenism—Progressive decline of their maxims. XI. Gallicanism gives no countenance to Dr. Pusey's principles.

SECTION VIII.

THE DIVINE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE AND THE GENERAL COUNCIL—SYNODS OF CONSTANCE AND FLORENCE.

(pp. 184—209.)

I. Subject of this Section. II. Inconsistency of the Gallican Articles. III. Normal and abnormal state of the Church during

schism caused by the rival claims of doubtful Popes—In such a case a General Assembly of Bishops has a right to settle the question between the competitors—Its authority is limited—The doctrine of the Pope's Superiority to the Council is the doctrine of antiquity. IV. Occasion of the Four Articles of Constance—They are opposed by the Cardinals and Bishops of Italy—A double question concerning these Four Articles. V. They were not proposed in the Synod as matters of Faith. VI. They do not concern the Church in its normal state—They were proposed by the Gerson faction in the wider sense, but adopted in the narrower. VII. The Decree of the Pseudo-Synod of Basle has no authority in the matter—Miserable end of the Synod—Conduct of Catholic England towards it—It was fully condemned in the General Council of Florence. VIII. The Œcumenical Synod of Florence defines as a matter of Faith the Divine Supremacy of the Pope—The Eastern Church in the Florentine Council fully accepted that definition—It implies the Superiority of the Pope to the General Council, although, out of prudence, this was not explicitly stated. IX. Groundless objection against the foregoing interpretation drawn from the Greek text of the Decree. X. This doctrine was always professed by antiquity—Cause of the decay of Gallicanism in France—Catholic maxims of the French Clergy before the Assembly of 1682—Conclusion of the Section.

CONCLUSION.

ANGLICANISM: ITS ORIGIN, NATURE, AND EFFECTS—ONLY REMEDY FOR ITS EVILS.

(pp. 210—228.)

I. Tendencies and difficulties of the High Church Party in England—Their inconsistent proposal about limiting the Papal Authority—True origin of the English Schism. II. The Apostacy of the Sixteenth Century—Anglican Schism the work of Kings—Dr. Pusey's twofold mistake in the matter—Schism of Henry VIII. consummated before the Bull of Excommunication, and the work of the King alone. III. The Church of England did not reform herself under Henry VIII.—Abject prostration of the English Clergy since the act of schism. IV. The Reformation carried out by Henry's supreme and uncontrolled authority. V. Dread and abhorrence of the Papacy a necessary consequence of schism and heresy—Mr. Palmer's singular remark on the obedience due

to the Pope. VI. Effects of the rejection of Papal Authority in England—Dr. Pusey's erroneous estimate of the present state of the Anglican Church—The last spark of life in it near extinction. VII. The re-establishment of the English Church is to be expected from her submission to Rome—Grounds for hopes of her conversion.

ERRATUM.

In p. 19, note 50, the author cited from memory a passage from Ammianus Marcellinus, and the words are erroneously given. They are as follows: "Id enim ille (Constantius) Athanasio semper infestus, licet sciret impletum, tamen auctoritate quâ potiores æternæ Urbis Episcopi firmari desiderio nitebatur ardenti."—L. xv., *Hist.*, c. vii., p. 99. Lugd., 1693.

THE SUPREME AUTHORITY OF THE POPE.

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

I. "THE doctrine of the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome over the universal Church is the point on which all other controversies between the Roman and the other Churches turn: for if our Lord Jesus Christ instituted any official supremacy of one bishop in the whole Catholic Church, to endure always, and if this supremacy be inherited by the Bishop of Rome, it will follow, that the Catholic Church is limited to the Roman Communion; and that the councils, doctrines, and traditions of that Communion are binding on the whole Christian world." With these words, Mr. Palmer begins Part VII. of his *Treatise on the Church of Christ*.[1] We most willingly adopt them in beginning this book on the Supremacy of the Roman Pontiffs, the more readily because Mr. Palmer expresses in them the views of a large and influential party.

Dr. Harold Browne, the present Bishop of Ely, who probably had in view this part of Mr. Palmer's work in commenting on Article XXXVII., expresses

[1] Palmer: *Treatise on the Church of Christ*, pt. vii., c. i, vol. ii., p. 369. London, 1842.

the same opinion. "If once," he says, "the supreme authority of the Roman Patriarch is conceded, all other Roman doctrines seem to follow as of course. And so it will probably be found, that all converts to the Roman Church have been led to it from a conviction of the necessity of being in communion with the Supreme Pontiff, not from persuasion of the truth of particular dogmas."[2] We gladly admit that Mr. Palmer and Dr. Browne have well understood and fairly state the full bearing of the matter in controversy. For in truth the main, the capital question between Catholicism and its opponents, turns entirely on the Pope's Primacy of divine right over the universal Church. Were Dr. Pusey and the whole High Church party to receive the Catholic doctrines of Transubstantiation, of Purgatory, of Devotion to the Blessed Virgin, of the Immaculate Conception, &c.; were they to hold all Catholic dogmas as explicitly as the schismatic Greek Church—they would be substantially no nearer to the true Church of Christ so long as they denied the claims of the Bishop of Rome. The true Church of Christ is one body: hence, no one can be a member of the body unless he be subject to the visible head which rules over the body.

II. The subject-matter of this work is by no means novel. Able and learned theologians have long since published many elaborate treatises upon this theme. The writer's purpose is not to exhibit under a new shape the results of their successful labours, but to meet the challenge implied in some modern publications, and chiefly in a late work of Dr. Pusey.[3] The object of the book is to prove as succinctly as possible, how wide of the mark are the blows aimed against that supreme divinely instituted authority, and that the arms wielded

[2] Dr. Browne: *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, Art. XXXVII., sect. ii., pp. 802, 3. London, 1856.

[3] *Eirenicon.*

are unsuited to the purpose for which they are employed. The writer will consider in the first place the divinely conferred supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, not only as an historical fact acknowledged by all Christian antiquity, but also as a matter of right, based upon the authority of Scripture itself. In a succeeding volume, the Infallibility of the Pope will be treated with reference to its foundations, extension and consequences. But, to proceed with method and clearness, the opinions held on the supremacy by Anglicans in general, and by Dr. Pusey himself, must first be examined.

III. Dr. Pusey, in terms, does not question that there is a visible head of the Church. In his *Eirenicon* he hints that he and his friends do not deny the visible head of the Church any more than the Eastern Church owns the monarchy of the Bishop of Rome.[4] And in the famous letter addressed by him to the *Weekly Register* (November 26, 1865), he declares that he "readily recognizes the primacy of the Bishop of Rome: the bearings of that primacy upon other local churches he believes to be matter of ecclesiastical, not of divine, law." Moreover, in the *Vindication of Tract XC.*, Dr. Pusey, in accordance with the Thirty-nine Articles, denies "that the Bishop of Rome has any lawful claims to spiritual supremacy over England." Nevertheless, he adds: "it may be said that a primacy of order and the claim that no council should be considered œcumenical and authoritative which lacked the concurrence of so eminent a see, as they will abundantly satisfy both the concessions of any of the early Fathers and the claims of the earlier Popes, so may they be obviously conceded without any risk to the safety of our Provincial Church."[5] In *Tract XC.* itself we find the

[4] *Eirenicon*, p. 66.

[5] Pusey: *The Articles treated in the Tract XC.*, &c., p. 139. Oxford, 1841.

doctrine which Dr. Pusey here intended to vindicate. It asserts that "there is nothing in the Apostolic system which gives any authority to the Pope over the Church, which it does not give to a bishop. It is altogether," it says, "an ecclesiastical arrangement, not a point *de fide*, but of expedience, custom, or piety, which cannot be claimed as if the Pope *ought* to have it, any more than on the other hand the King could of divine right claim the supremacy." "Bishop," it states, "is superior to bishop only in rank, and not in power, and the Bishop of Rome the head of the Catholic world, is not the centre of unity, except as having a primacy of order." All these statements, indeed, follow from the Anglican view of the Church of Christ. Because, as is said in the *Tract*, "the portions of the Church need not otherwise have been united together for their essential completeness than as being descended from one original. They are like a number of colonies sent out from a mother country. . . . Each church is independent of all the rest, and is to act on the principle of what may be called 'episcopal independence,' except, indeed, so far as the civil power unites any number of them together."[6] In this manner *Tract XC.* clears the English Church from the charge of schism, since in releasing itself from the Roman Supremacy, it remained essentially complete without Rome. So that the Anglicans, in order to free themselves from the charge of schism, are forced to alter the essential features of the divine plan of the Church of Christ.

IV. Dr. Pusey, with the Anglicans, adheres to the statement of *Tract XC.*, which formally denies the monarchical character of the Church, both under the government of the Apostles and that of their successors. They acknowledge in St. Peter a pre-eminence of honour

[6] *Tract XC.*, sec. 12, pp. 78, 79. Edition of 1841.

given by Our Lord, for reasons, which, as Mr. Palmer says, were not revealed to the Church.[7] They recognize too in the Bishop of Rome a pre-eminence, which he did not inherit by divine right from St. Peter, but which may be accounted for by the peculiar circumstances of the Church of Rome. Nevertheless, they add, this pre-eminence of honour gave him no claim over other bishops and their flocks. This system was fully developed by Mr. Palmer;[8] it is, more or less, that of the old Church of England divines, and it has been set forth in *Tract XC.*, and was obstinately maintained by the Oxford party throughout the course of the Tractarian movement. The Thirty-Seventh Article is commonly interpreted in the same sense by the standard expositors. We may, for example, cite Burnet,[9] Beveridge,[10] Dr. Browne,[11] and others. The Anglican system, therefore, can be summarily stated as follows:—1. Jesus Christ did not bestow on St. Peter a supremacy of jurisdiction over the other Apostles, but only a pre-eminence of rank, incapable of transmission. Hence, a divinely-instituted monarchical government is not to be found in the Church. 2. The Bishop of Rome does not possess a primacy by divine right: his pre-eminence is owing to certain peculiar circumstances, and to ecclesiastical institution. 3. To this we may add, on the assertion of Dr. Pusey, that the extension of the Papal power is to be attributed in an especial manner to the false decretals, which

[7] Palmer: l. c., p. 370.

[8] Palmer: *Treatise on the Church of Christ*, chs. iii.—vi., pp. 384—416.

[9] Burnet: *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 386, et seq. London, 1826.

[10] Beveridge: *The Doctrine of the Church of England; Discourse upon the Thirty-nine Articles.* Works, vol. vii., p. 571, et seq. Oxford, 1845.

[11] Browne: *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 803, et seq.

introduced a system alien to the original constitution of Christ's Church. These are the chief heads of doctrine concerning the authority of the Roman Pontiff implied by the Anglican system as set forth by the divines of the Church of England who are held in most esteem, and by the Tractarian school of the present day. The grounds on which these principles rest, in no means differ from those by which schismatics and Protestants of all times have ever sought to justify their apostacy from Christ's holy Church.

SECTION I.

UNITY AND SUPREMACY IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

PROTESTANTS of every denomination have constantly misapprehended the fundamental idea of Catholic unity. Despite the efforts and influence of the Tractarian movement, the Oxford school did not, in the least, succeed in removing or modifying this misapprehension; for we find that the very starting-point of the Tractarian system is the assumption that bishops are naturally independent. Now this independence of the Episcopate is declared to mean that no church or diocese can exercise control or jurisdiction within the boundaries of another church or diocese. But such is not the true idea of that Catholic unity which Christ revealed, and to which all antiquity bears witness. This may be seen from a consideration of the two chief prototypes on which the Church was to be modelled. These are:—(1.) the Word made flesh; (2.) the most Holy Trinity. With reference to the former, St. Paul tells us that, "As the body is one, and has many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ."[12] Now, in this and similar passages, as the Fathers have aptly observed,[13] the apostle desig-

[12] 1 Cor. xii. 12. *Καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ἓν ἐστιν καὶ μέλη ἔχει πολλά, πάντα δὲ τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος πολλὰ ὄντα ἓν ἐστιν σῶμα, οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστός.*

[13] See St. Chrysostom: *Hom.* xxx. in 1 Cor. n. 1 (Op., tom. x., pp. 269—70. Edit. Maur). August.: *De Civit. Dei*, l. xxii., c. xvii. (Op., t. vii., p. 513. Edit. Maur, Antwerpiae). St. Gregory of Nyssa states that the Church is often (*πολλαχῆ*) named (*κατονομάζεται*) Christ by St. Paul.—*De Vita Mosis* (Op., tom. i., p. 226. Edit. Parisiis, 1637).

nates the Church by the name of Christ Himself. For as Eve was formed by the divine hand from the flesh of Adam, and fashioned to the likeness of God, so the Church is formed from the flesh of Christ, and made to His likeness.[14] Our blessed Lord Himself, in the prayer addressed to His divine Father, has revealed to us the second, and a heavenly, prototype of His Church—the Holy Trinity: "Neither do I pray for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on and through their word; that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me."[15] Christ, by these words, evidently meant His Church as it was destined to endure until the consummation of the world, since unto the last there were to be believers in Christ, for whom He was then praying. This is clear from the text itself. Moreover, He said of His Church, that it should bear the likeness of that divine unity of the Father with the Son in which consists the great mystery of the most Holy Trinity. So that the Word of God made Man, and the most Holy Trinity, are the two great Scriptural prototypes after the pattern of which the Church was to be modelled. The Church, therefore, was intended to reveal to all future ages the essential characters of those divine types. Nay, the unbelieving of the world, by seeing in the Church the copy of patterns so perfect, were to be led to believe that the doctrine of Christ was from God, for Christ Himself added in His prayer—"that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me."[16]

II. What, then, are the essential characters of these divine prototypes? The first, the most prominent, and the one common to both, is that most singular and

[14] Ephes. v. 30, coll., Gen. ii. 20, 21.

[15] St. John xvii. 20, 21. (Protestant version.)

[16] St. John xvii. 21. *Ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύσῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.*

incomparable unity, which is divinely associated with an admirable plurality of persons in the most Holy Trinity, and of natures in the Incarnation: the unity of the former is a unity of nature, the unity of the latter is a personal unity. But the nature of the Triune God, and the person of the God-man, are the centre and the source of every virtue, power, and prerogative. Further, both the persons of the most Holy Trinity, and the natures in the Man-God, are really distinct, but not separate: the absence of distinction would destroy their plurality, any division would destroy their unity—plurality and unity are the two great pivots, so to say, on which these divine mysteries turn. The Church of Christ, consequently, would not show forth the essential characteristics of its divine prototypes, unless it possess a centre which is to serve as the source of its unity, power, and greatness. Thus, plurality without division, and union without confusion, are to be the essential characters of the Church of Christ. Again, Christ required that His Church should be one with a unity as perfect in its kind as that by which the Father is in Him and He in the Father. Now, if the most complete and perfect unity possible is to be the condition of the Church, it follows that since numerical unity is the most perfect expression of unity, none other can be such as is required by our Lord in His Church.[17] On this account, unity which, by divine institution, exists in the Church, whilst harmonising perfectly with the Catholic doctrine of the supremacy of St. Peter and his successors, is in glaring contradiction with the Anglican view; and the more so as the perfect unity intended by Christ was, as we have said, to be apparent and visible.[18] For, since

[17] ἵνα πάντες ἓν ὦσιν. ver. 21. ἵνα ὦσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἕν. ver. 23.

[18] Mr. Allies, in his learned work, *The See of St. Peter* (sect. iii.), has handled the subject with his usual ability; but we have taken a somewhat different view of the matter, and, by closer adher-

the Church is spread over all the earth, and is destined to last until the end of the world, in no way could a unity so perfect be made apparent and visible unless by a visible centre numerically one, to which, as to a common focus, every part of the whole Church might converge, and from which jurisdiction, authority, and life might spread, permeating the several grades of the hierarchy from the highest to the lowest. Now, such a visible unity necessarily implies the supremacy of St. Peter and his successors in the Church.

III. The Fathers, and all Christian antiquity, acknowledge the closest connection between the unity of the Church, as represented by Christ, and the headship of one universal pastor. "Wherefore," says St. Cyprian, "the Lord, speaking of the unity which is derived from a divine authority, declares and says: 'I and the Father are one.' And, reducing His church to this unity, He again says: 'And there shall be one fold and one shepherd.'"[19] The same doctrine was inculcated by those confessors of Christ who returned from the Novatian schism to the unity of the Church. "We know," said they, "that Cornelius has been chosen Bishop of the Holy Catholic Church by the Almighty God and Christ our Lord. We confess our error. We have been seduced by calumny. For we are not ignorant that God is one, that Christ our Lord is one, whom we have confessed: the Holy Ghost is one, and the Bishop of the Catholic Church should be one."[20] In

ence to the text, have been able, we trust, to make the reasoning more cogent.

[19] "Idcirco Dominus insinuans unitatem de divina auctoritate venientem ponit et dicit: Ego et Pater unum sumus. Ad quam unitatem redigens Ecclesiam suam denuo dicit: Et erit unus grex et unus pastor."—*Epist.* lxvi., *ad Magnum.* Edit. Baluz., p. 150.

[20] "Nos Cornelium Episcopum sanctissimæ Catholicæ Ecclesiæ electum a Deo Omnipotente et Christo Domino nostro scimus. Nos errorem nostrum confitemur. Imposturam passi sumus.

the same sense Pope Cornelius, in his epistle to Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, used the following expression, pointing out the crime of Novatus: "This assertor of the Gospel did not know that there can be but one Bishop in the Catholic Church."[21] In both these letters the name of Catholic Church is applied to the Church of Rome exclusively—that is, to St. Peter's Chair—on account of its being the centre, the root, the source, and the matrix, of Catholic unity.[22] And to the same effect St. Ambrose writes: "Where Peter is, there is the Church."[23] By which words the holy Doctor means that Peter and his successors are the centre of the unity of the Church, the source and root of its power and life, thus containing, as it were, the whole Church within themselves. St. Jerome had the same thought before his mind when writing his well-known letter to St. Damasus, in which he solemnly proclaimed: "Whoever is united to the Church of Peter is with me."[24] He then, as well as St. Ambrose, acknowledges in the Chair of St. Peter the centre of unity, and the source of authority in the Church, since he solemnly asserts that whoever was in connection with that chair, ought to be regarded as in communion with

Nec enim ignoramus Deum esse et unum Christum esse Dominum quem confessi sumus, unum Spiritum sanctum, unum Episcopum in Catholica Ecclesia esse debere."—*Epist. Cornelii Papæ ad Cyprianum* (inter Epist. St. Cypr., epist. xlvi.). Edit. Baluz., pp. 60, 61.

[21] *Epist. Cornelii ad Fabium Antioch.*, penes Eusebium, *Hist. Eccl.*, l. vi., c. xliii. Edit. Valesii., p. 244. Ὁ ἐκδικητὴς οὖν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὐκ ἠπίστατο ἕνα ἐπίσκοπον δεῖν ἐν καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.

[22] "Ecclesiæ Catholicæ radicem et matricem."—S. Cyprianus, *Epist.* xlv., *ad Cornelium Papam*, p. 59.

[23] S. Ambrosius: In Psalmum xl., n. 30 (Op., tom. i., p. 879. Edit., Maur., Parisiis). "Ubi Petrus ibi et Ecclesia."

[24] "Ego interim clamito, si quis cathedræ Petri jungitur, meus est."—S. Hieronym., *Epist.* xvi., *ad Damasum Papam*, n. 2. (Op., vol. i., p. 43. Edit. Vallarsii.)

the universal Church, being in communion with the very source of authority, jurisdiction, and life in the Church. The language of these Fathers may throw light upon another passage of St. Cyprian: "The Church," says this Father, "is one, though she be spread abroad and multiply with the increase of her progress, even as the sun has many rays, yet but one light, and the tree many boughs, yet its strength is one, residing in the deep-lodged root; and as, when many streams flow from one source, though a multiplicity of waters seem to be diffused from the bountifulness of the overflowing abundance, unity is maintained in the source itself."[25] Now, what in the language of St. Cyprian is meant by the sun which has many rays; the root which distributes vegetative life through many branches; the source from which flow a multiplicity of streams and waters? Unquestionably, the primacy and the authority of St. Peter. Indeed, in the very place from which we have quoted the above passage, and in immediate connection with it, we find the following: "Upon Peter, *being one*, He built His Church, and though He gave to all the apostles equal power, . . . yet, in order to *manifest unity*, He by His own authority so placed the source of the same unity as to begin from one."[26] And in many places of his epistles also, the same holy Father and martyr inculcates the doctrine that "the Gospel unity springs from the chair of St. Peter, and the principal Church" (of Rome). Thus, in his letter to Pope Cornelius he writes:[27] "The one Church was founded by Christ our Lord upon Peter, the fountain-head and principle of unity." Again, in the

[25] S. Cyprianus: *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, p. 195.

[26] "Super illum unum ædificat Ecclesiam suam et illi pascendas mandat oves suas," &c.—l.c.

[27] "Cathedra Petri et Ecclesia principalis unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est."—*Epist.* lv., p. 86.

letter to the Bishops of Numidia,[28] he teaches that by the appointment and doctrine of Christ unity should spring from Peter. Again, in the letter to Jubajanus.[29] And we find similar expressions in his epistles to Pope Cornelius and to Antonianus:[30] he declares that to be in communion with the Bishop of Rome is equivalent to being in communion with the whole Catholic Church. Thus, according to St. Cyprian, the centre and root of unity in the Church, the source of its strength and life, is numerically one, and made visible in the supremacy of St. Peter. Neither were the Fathers of the following centuries ignorant of this primary doctrine. St. Jerome taught it most distinctly in his work against Jovinian, as well as in his dialogue against the Luciferians. For instance, he assigns the reason why one Apostle was chosen out of the twelve, "that a head being appointed, the occasion of schism might be removed."[31] And he urges the same doctrine upon the Luciferians, warning them that unless the dignity and supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff be maintained, the Church, rent by schisms, would fall to ruin.[32] Such was the teaching of St.

[28] "Una Ecclesia a Christo Domino super Petrum origine unitatis et ratione fundatur."—*Epist.* lxx., p. 125.

[29] "Petro primum Dominus super quem ædificavit Ecclesiam et unde unitatis originem instituit et ostendit, potestatem istam dedit."—*Epist.* lxxiii., p. 131.

[30] "Te Collegæ nostri et communionem tuam idest *Catholicæ Ecclesiæ unitatem* pariter et caritatem probarent firmiter et tenerent."—*Epist.* xlv., *ad Cornel.*, p. 59. "Ut sciret (Cornelius Papa) te secum, hoc est cum Catholica Ecclesia communicare."—*Epist.* lii., *ad Antonianum*, p. 66.

[31] "Propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur ut capite constituto, schismatis tollatur occasio."—S. Hieronym, l. i., *adv. Jovinianum*, n. 26. (Op., t. ii., p. 279.)

[32] "Ecclesiæ salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet: cui si non exors quaedam et ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in Ecclesiis efficientur schismata, quot sacerdotes."—*Adv. Lucifer.*, n. 9. (Op., t. ii., p. 182.)

Jerome in the fifth century, and his doctrine is a perfect echo of that of the two preceding ages. St. Optatus, of Milevis, in his well-known work on the schism of the Donatists, proclaimed the same principle, which had been transmitted to him from the age of St. Cyprian. "In the city of Rome," he says, "the Episcopal chair was first conferred on Peter, wherein the head of the Apostolic College was to sit, whence, too, he is called *Cephas*, to the end that in this chair unity might be maintained by all."[33] He further adds, that, "To secure unity, blessed Peter . . . both merited to be preferred before all the Apostles, and alone received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, in order that he should communicate them to the rest."[34] In the same age, St. Pacian, a contemporary of St. Optatus, speaks to the same purpose. His words are as follows: "According to the relation of St. Matthew himself, the Lord spoke first to Peter alone: He spoke to one, in order that He might lay the foundation of unity from one."[35]

IV. But it is needless to accumulate quotations from the Fathers in a matter which has been acknowledged even by enemies of Catholic unity. The very leaders of Gallicanism, to whom so bold an appeal is made, unanimously held the doctrine of all the Fathers on this subject. Bossuet, in his *Exposition de la Doctrine Catholique*, says: "Le Fils de Dieu ayant voulu que son Eglise fût une, et solidement bâtie sur l'unité, a établi et institué

[33] "Igitur negare non potes in urbe Roma Petro primo cathedram episcopalem fuisse collatam in qua sederit omnium Apostolorum caput Petrus; unde et Cephas appellatus est: in qua una cathedra, unitas ab omnibus servatur."—Optatus Milevit, *De Schismate Donatistarum*, l. ii., c. ii. Edit. Migne, p. 947.

[34] *Ibid.*, l. vii., c. iii., p. 1087. "Bono unitatis beatus Petrus . . . et præferri Apostolis omnibus meruit et claves regni cœlorum communicandas cæteris, solus accepit." And p. 1088, "Peccator (Petrus) accipit claves ut unitatis negotium formaretur."

[35] S. Pacianus: *Epist.* iii., n. xi. (penes Galland., t. vii., p. 265).

la Primauté de St. Pierre pour l'entretenir et la cimenter. C'est pourquoi nous reconnaissons cette même Primauté dans les successeurs du Prince des Apôtres, auxquels on doit pour cette raison la soumission et l'obéissance que les Saints Conciles et les Saints Peres out toujours enseignée à tous les fidèles." And he adds: "Si les auteurs de la Réformation prétendue eussent aimé l'unité, ils n' auraient ni aboli le gouvernement épiscopal, qui est établi par Jésus-Christ même, et que l'on voit en vigueur des le temps des apôtres, ni méprisé l'autorité de la chaire de Saint Pierre qui a un fondement si certain dans l'Evangile, et une suite si évidente dans la Tradition : mais plutôt ils auraient conservé soigneusement et l'autorité de l'Episcopat, qui établit l'unité dans les églises particulières, et la primauté du siége de Saint Pierre, qui est le centre commun de toute l'unité Catholique."[36] Bossuet both in the above-mentioned *Exposition*, and in the *Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, declares that the doctrines he had set forth concerning the Apostolic See in the earlier work were dogmas of Catholic faith;[37] and he again insists in the latter book that "the primacy of St. Peter was established in the Church for the defence and support of unity;" and that "the Apostolic See is the centre and the root of that unity."[38] Nay, more, Bossuet rejected the error of Du Pin, and stigmatised it in the severest terms, as contrary to the Catholic faith. Let us hear how the great Bishop of Meaux spoke of this suspected doctor of the Sorbonne in his *Memoire* to

[36] Bossuet: *Exposition de la Doctrine Catholique*, c. xxi. Ouvrages, tom. iv., p. 400. Edit. Paris, 1862.

[37] "Quo loco de Sede Apostolica vera Ecclesiæ fides exponenda esset."—Bossuet, *Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, t. i., p. i., l. iii., c. xii., p. 85. Basileæ, 1730.

[38] "Ecclesiam unitate nixam, tuendæ ac firmandæ unitati Primatum S. Petri a Christo institutum, Sedemque Apostolicam hujus unitatis centrum et radicem esse."—*Ibid.*

the Chancellor of France. "Dans l'abrégé de la discipline notre auteur (Du Pin) n' attribue autre chose au Pape sinon que l'Eglise Romaine fondée par les Apôtres S. Pierre et S. Paul, soit considerée comme la première entre tous les évêques, sans attribuer au Pape aucune jurisdiction sur eux, ni dire le moindre mot de l'institution divine de sa Primauté ; au contraire, il met cet article au rang de la discipline qu' il dit lui même être variable. . . . Une des plus belles prérogatives de la Chaire de S. Pierre, la Chaire principale, où tous les fidèles doivent garder l'unité, et comme l'appella S. Cyprien, *la source de l'unité sacerdotale.* C'est une des marques de l'Eglise Catholique divinement expliquée par S. Optat. . . . C'est le génie de nos critiques modernes de trouver grossiers ceux qui reconnaissent dans la Papauté une authorité supérieure établie de droit divin. Lorsqu' on le reconnaît avec toute l'antiquité, c'est que l'on veut flatter Rome et se la rendre favourable, comme notre auteur le reproche à son censeur."[39] From the passage here quoted from Bossuet, Anglican divines and their followers may learn the terms on which Bossuet would have agreed to the union of the Church of England with that of Rome.[40] They are as follows:—1. Christ, in order to give unity to His Church, founded it on the primacy and supremacy of St. Peter's Chair. 2. This doctrine is contained both in Scripture and in the tradition of all antiquity. 3. Episcopal authority is intended to give unity to particular churches, but the unity of the whole Catholic Church flows from the supreme authority of the see of Rome, which is its root and centre. 4. The chair of Peter, in virtue of its supremacy, has jurisdiction

[39] Bossuet: *Mémoire de ce que est à corriger dans la Nouvelle Bibliothèque de M. Du Pin.* (Ouvrages, tom. vi., p. 662.)

[40] "On the terms which Bossuet, we hope, would have sanctioned, we long to see the Church united."—Pusey, *Eirenicon*, p. 335.

over all bishops, and this jurisdiction is of divine right. 5. These propositions regarding the supremacy of St. Peter and his successors belong to the deposit of faith, and are not merely a part of the variable discipline of the Church.

V. We were surprised to read in Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*, the bold assertion that he would be content to unite England with Rome upon the terms which have the sanction of Bossuet. Does he not know that the doctrine of Bossuet was grounded exclusively on the authority both of the Church and of the Roman Pontiff? On this ground, his *Exposition of the Catholic Doctrine* was approved and praised by Innocent XI. in two briefs addressed to the author.[41] But on that very account it was obstinately opposed by members of the English communion of that day, and notably by Dr. Wake, "whose writings published on this occasion," says Dr. Maclaine, "gave him a distinguished rank among the victorious champions of the Protestant cause."[42] Later on, Dr. Wake listened favourably to the views of Du Pin; but the basis of their correspondence, as appears from its perusal, was the utter overthrow of Papal authority;[43] for Du Pin was always on the verge of Protestantism, and he well deserved the judgment passed on him by Clement XI., who spoke of him as "*a man most unsound in doctrine, and guilty of many excesses against the Apostolic See.*"[44] Dr. Pusey cannot be ignorant of this: why then does he place Dr. Wake and Du Pin on a level with Bossuet? as if the teaching

[41] Bossuet: *Ouvrages*, t. iv., p. 375, et seq.

[42] Maclaine: *Account of the Correspondence between Dr. W. Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, and certain Doctors of the Sorbonne.* (Appendix to the fourth volume of Mosheim, Soames' edition, p. 513.)

[43] Maclaine was right in making that remark in the *Account*, &c., p. 515.

[44] Feller: *Dict. Hist. Du Pin*, p. 255. Lyon, 1818.

of the illustrious Bishop of Meaux had aught in common with that of the Jansenistic writer. How is it that he longs for communion with Rome on terms which Bossuet would have sanctioned, whilst maintaining the explanation given to the Thirty-seventh Article by Du Pin and agreed to by Dr. Wake, although this explanation wholly discarded the divine authority of the Pope?[45] How can he claim to agree with Bossuet, when he even "professes to admit no connection whatever between the unity of the Church and the primacy of St. Peter?"

VI. It is, indeed, wonderful that a man, whom we know to have devoted his life mainly to the study of the Fathers, can have failed to perceive the intimate connection of the doctrine of the unity of the Church with that of St. Peter's primacy, which is so clearly stated by the Fathers of every age. Dr. Pusey speaks of that doctrine as of an opinion held by certain parties or schools of little importance. "It is alleged," he tells us, "that the Papal power has been the centre of unity. Christendom was united when it was persecuted by emperors; proscribed, and, as they thought, annihilated; when the Bishop of Rome had a precedence of dignity, not of power, and the Church was connected and joined together by the cement of bishops mutually cleaving to each other,[46] each bishop ordering and directing his own proceedings, having, hereafter to give account of his intentions to the Lord."[47] In this passage Dr. Pusey betrays complete ignorance of the fact that antiquity has ever taught that the institution of the supremacy is connected with the very fundamental plan of the Church, and was intended by Christ to secure to it

[45] See *Eirenicon*, p. 234.

[46] *Eirenicon*, p. 236. Dr. Pusey quotes these words from St. Cyprian's *Epist.* lxvi. Edit. Oxford Tran., p. 204.

[47] Dr. Pusey quotes these words from *Epist.* lv. of St. Cyprian. Edit. Oxford Tran., p. 129; and *Epist.* lxix., p. 165.

unity. Thus, he says, "It is *alleged* that the Papal power has been the centre of unity." As if such a fact could be ascribed to external and accidental circumstances, as Mr. Palmer seems to have imagined in his *Treatise of the Church.*[48] Dr. Pusey next asserts that Christendom was united during the fearful persecutions of the pagan emperors. Certainly! But how can he prove from this that the constitution of the Church was different then from what it is at present? Or that even at that time the monarchical supremacy of Peter was not the source of the Church's unity? Even though no visible traces remained of this supremacy, still its non-existence would not be proved. To establish this, we must have positive facts showing that persons who expressly denied that supremacy, and opposed it on principle, were regarded as remaining in the communion of the Church Catholic. But is it true that the supreme power of the successors of St. Peter lay dormant during the first centuries of the Church? A fuller answer shall be given to this question hereafter. For the present we will merely remark that there is no ground for supposing with Dr. Pusey, that from the first ages of Christianity to the promulgation of the false decretals,[49] the Bishops of Rome had a precedence of dignity, but not of primacy. We are astonished that the members of the High Church party, notwithstanding the zeal they profess in the *study of antiquity*, should be ignorant of that which was known to Ammianus Marcellinus, a writer of the fourth century, and commonly reputed a pagan. He relates, as a matter of public notoriety, "that the supreme authority over all Christians was vested in the Bishop of Rome."[50]

[48] Palmer: *Treatise on the Church of Christ*, pt. vii., c. iii., vol. ii., p. 384.

[49] *Eirenicon*, p. 237, et seq.

[50] "In Episcopo Romano positam esse præcipuam auctoritatem Christianorum."—Amm. Marcellin., l. xv., *Hist.*, c. vii. See "Erratum" C 2 pg XVI.

In the course of our work this assertion will be fully demonstrated.

VII. But the two passages quoted from St. Cyprian prove the exact opposite of that for which they are adduced. In both passages, Dr. Pusey cites the last words only, omitting the preceding portion of the text, which tells completely against him. St. Cyprian, in his epistle to Florentius,[51] is writing against those who departed from their own bishops. He says that, unless they are in communion with their own bishop, they cannot be in connection with Christ; and the reason is given, that, though they withdraw from their pastors, the Church (that is the flock with its shepherd) does not depart from Christ. And it is in vain that they pretend to be in communion with some of the bishops, because, he continues, "the Church, which is Catholic and one, is not rent and divided, but connected and joined together by the cement of the bishops mutually cleaving to each other."[52] Now, we remark, first, if the Catholic Church is one, and, therefore, not rent and divided (*scissa non est neque divisa*), how can it consist of three divided branches, as in the system of Dr. Pusey and of the High Church party in England? Secondly, if, according to St. Cyprian, it is an essential character of the Catholic

[51] *Epist.* lxix., p. 123-24. Baluze's edition.

[52] The whole passage is as follows:—"Loquitur hic (Joan. vi., 68—70) Petrus, supra quem ædificanda fuerat Ecclesia, Ecclesiæ nomine docens et ostendens quia etsi contumax et superba obaudire nolentium multitudo discedat, Ecclesia tamen a Christo non recedit, et illi sunt Ecclesia plebs sacerdoti adunata et pastori suo grex adhærens. Unde scire debes Episcopum in Ecclesia esse et Ecclesiam in Episcopo, et si quis cum Episcopo non sit, in Ecclesia non esse, et frustra sibi blandiri eos qui pacem cum sacerdotibus Dei non habentes obrepunt et latenter quosdam communicare se credunt, quando Ecclesia quæ Catholica et una est, scissa non sit, neque divisa, sed sit ubique connexa et cohærentium sibi invicem sacerdotum glutine copulata."—l. c.

Church that all its bishops cleave one to another, how can the Anglican Establishment be a portion of the Catholic Church, when its bishops are in formal and absolute disagreement with all the bishops of hundreds of millions of Christians? And when, moreover, according to the Anglican principle, each bishop with his own flock is a complete church, which depends as little on other bishops as an ancient and independent colony on other settlements of the same race scattered up and down the world? Thirdly, in the view of St. Cyprian, the bishops are as the circumference of a circle. In order then that unity may be perfect, they must cleave to each other so as to entirely close the pale of the Church against schismatics and heretics; and they must cleave to the centre of the circle so that they may be gathered into a perfect unity: and thus, as every particular church is in the bishop, and its unity is constituted by him, the universal Church may be also in the bishop of all the bishops—this being the essential condition of its unity. Now, had St. Cyprian in this epistle mentioned the first kind only of the unity which is maintained by the bishops in the Church, it would not follow that he had denied the second, especially as the passages, quoted above, from the writings of this holy martyr, prove the contrary. But such is not the case. St. Cyprian, in the very passage on which we are commenting, mentions the second kind of unity, which the bishops are to guard, when he writes: "Then (St. John, vi., 86—70) speaks Peter, upon whom the Church was to be built." He then adds that *Church* means "the people united to its pastor and the flock adhering to its shepherd:" therefore, every bishop united to his flock was to be built upon Peter. Is not this the second kind of unity, which all the bishops are to maintain in the Church of Christ? As regards the other passage[53] of

[53] Edit. Balutii. *Epist.* lii., p. 72.

St. Cyprian, quoted by Dr. Pusey, from the epistle to Antonianus, the writer expressly says: "Having preserved the bond of concord, and constantly kept the sacrament of the individual unity of the Catholic Church, each bishop ordering, &c."[54] If the passage be quoted at full length, it presents no difficulty whatever against the Catholic doctrine, since no one has ever denied the divine authority of each bishop within the limits of his diocese, provided he keeps the laws of Catholic unity, which oblige every bishop to subordination to the supreme jurisdiction of the successor of St. Peter. And this is proved by the other epistle, to Cornelius, quoted by Dr. Pusey,[55] where St. Cyprian, alluding to the authority of the bishop, asserts that the chair of St. Peter is the centre and the source of episcopal unity.[56] Thus, so far from these passages making against the doctrine of supremacy, they harmonise with it, and complete the idea of the unity of the Church as established by Christ.

VIII. But if the High Church party rejects the doctrine of the supremacy, from what principle then can unity be derived to the Church? Necessarily from the headship of Christ, and from that alone.[57] The views of Anglican writers on this point are identical with those of the Greek communion,[58] as well as with the principles

[54] The entire passage is as follows: "Manente concordiæ vinculo et perseverante Catholicæ Ecclesiæ individuo sacramento, actum suum disponit et dirigit unusquisque Episcopus, rationem propositi sui Domino redditurus."—l. c.

[55] Edit. Balutii, *Epist.* lv., p. 86.

[56] "Pseudo episcopo sibi ab hæreticis constituto, navigare audent, et ad Petri cathedram, atque ad Ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est."—l. c.

[57] *Eirenicon*, p. 54—56.

[58] Διδασχόμεζα πῶς μόνος ὁ Χριστὸς εἶναι κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας κατὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν τοῦ ἀποστόλου. Conf. Orthod. Resp. ad Interrog. 85. Schelestrate: *Acta Orient. Eccl.*, p. 495. Winer: *Comparative Darstellung des Lehrbegriffs*, p. 171. Leipzig, 1837.

admitted by all Protestants.[59] Dr. Pusey, nevertheless, admits that "Christ employs the outward ministry of men, appointed in succession, from the day when he breathed on the apostles."[60] He further admits that the Church was framed like a body, to which spiritual nourishment is ministered by Christ in order to the growth of the whole. Now the capital error of Dr. Pusey, as well as of all Protestants, is to confound the inward source and supreme principle of invisible unity in the Church with the outward and subordinate principle of its visible oneness. The action of this double principle is necessary in every part of the economy of the Church. Christ is really the vine, from which the sap of life is infused and distributed throughout the mystical body of the Church. His Holy Spirit abides in it for ever, teaching it all truths; maintains its energy and vigour in its never-ending struggle with the powers of darkness, and pours into it divine consolations in its afflictions and persecutions. Christ is, indeed, the head of the Church, and the Church is His body and fulness.[61] St. Paul often inculcates this doctrine in his epistles;[62] but the holy Apostle never calls Him the *sole* head of the Church, whilst he does point to Him as the sole saviour of men; and at the same time he teaches that the Church is one body, even as God is one, faith one, baptism one.[63] Thus the doctrine of the Apostle on the headship of Christ in the Church, does not exclude a secondary and visible head, but rather implies it. The Church is com-

[59] "Ecclesia non potest ullum aliud habere caput quam Christum."—*Conf. Helv.*, ii., c. 17; and other passages quoted by Winer, l. c., p. 171-72.

[60] *Eirenicon*, p. 55.

[61] Ephes. i. 23.

[62] Ephes. i. 22; v. 23; Coloss. i. 18.

[63] Ephes. iv. 4, 5.

pared by St. Paul to a body on account of its visible unity. Now, the image of a visible body cannot be preserved without a visible head; for who can imagine a body one and visible, whose head only is invisible? Especially as, according to the doctrine of St. Paul, the external ministry and the ecclesiastical hierarchy were called forth and established by Christ in His Church for the purpose of bringing it to an outward and visible unity; "for the perfecting," says the Apostle, "of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all meet in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."[64] Truly it is from Christ and His divine influence that "the whole body," as the same apostle speaks, "fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplies, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, makes increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."[65] But still, according to the divine economy of Christ's Church, that invisible divine influence could not have realised and perfected the visible unity and action of the Church without the external framework of a visible hierarchy. Dr. Pusey, indeed, as we have already remarked, does not deny this position; but he refuses to admit the consequences which flow from it. In fact, the doctrine of the unity of the Church implies the unity both of each diocese, as of an integral portion of the whole Church, and of all dioceses collectively, as constituting one and the same body. Now, the unity of individual dioceses is maintained and signified by the oneness of the bishop, in whom, as the fathers speak, the Church culminates; so that a church separated from its bishop is separated also from Christ, and is consequently de-

[64] Ephes. iv. 12, 13. [65] Ephes. iv. 14.

prived of the mystic influx of His headship. But how is unity to be maintained in all the numerous members of the great body of the Church, if not by a universal bishop, the image of the divine and invisible bishop who is in heaven?—a universal bishop, inferior and subordinate to Him, and receiving at His hands authority and power, but at the same time the channel of jurisdiction and unity in the Church. It is altogether illogical for those who admit the necessity of a bishop for each diocese, to deny the necessity of a universal bishop. Presbyterians are less inconsistent in this matter than Episcopalian Protestants. And, in truth, on what ground is the view based which denies the necessity of a universal bishop for the maintenance of the unity of the universal Church? Christ, they say, as Head of the Church suffices to give it unity. But if He is sufficient to give unity to the whole, why may He not give the same property to the several parts? If the existence of an invisible divine head be not inconsistent with the existence of the hierarchy of bishops, why should it be incompatible with the existence of a visible head and centre of unity? If a visible head be necessary in each diocese to maintain the unity of the same, is it not still more requisite that there should exist a visible head whose function is to maintain the unity of the Church Catholic? Consistency seems to require that this be admitted.

IX. This will be rendered still more apparent if we compare the principles of the *Eirenicon* in the matter of unity with those of *Tract XC.*, to which Dr. Pusey professes to adhere. In *Tract XC.*, sec. 12, we read as follows: "Each Church is independent of all the rest, and is to act on the principle of what may be called episcopal independence, except, indeed, so far as the civil power unites any number of them together. . . . Each diocese is a perfect independent church, sufficient

for itself, and the communion of Christians one with another, and the union of them altogether, lie . . . in what they are and have in common, in their possession of the succession, their episcopal form, their apostolic faith, and the use of the sacraments." From this statement we conclude that, in the Anglican view, the Church has no unity whatever; each church and each bishop is wholly unconnected with any other, except so far as some are bound together in external communion by the authority of the state; but the state has no mission whatever to interfere with the organisation of the Church: so that in the system advocated by *Tract XC.*, the unity of the Church is an internal only and invisible unity. Now let us apply to the Tractarian view the argument lately developed. St. Paul insists on the necessity of an outward and visible hierarchy in the Church, for the purpose of originating and preserving its unity. But of what unity is St. Paul speaking? Doubtless of the unity of the body (ἓν σῶμα); but this is an outward and corporate unity, according to the language of the Scripture. The unity of the body implies social organisation: what the joints are in a body, that is the ecclesiastical hierarchy in the Church. But that cannot be called a body which is not "fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplies;" therefore, that is no church in which the hierarchy of pastors in strong and compact organisation does not concur to unite the whole into one. It follows that the Anglican view of the Church is in evident contradiction with the doctrine of unity as taught in Scripture. The author of the *Eirenicon* wishes, perhaps, to give some colour to this view, when, adopting as his own the words of St. Cyprian, quoted above, he maintains that "the Church was connected and joined together by the cement of bishops mutually cleaving to each other."[66] Now, is

[66] *Eirenicon*, p. 236.

what is here stated a mere fact, or a fact and at the same time a principle? If it be meant as a fact, and a fact only, we yet need to be told what is the principle of unity in the Church as established by Christ. If Dr. Pusey denies any such principle, he should first explain how the Church can be one body when individual parts are complete in themselves. If the Church must be a body, its parts must appear complete, not only regarded in themselves, but also when looked at in connection with the whole, since the idea of the member of a body implies incompleteness in relation to that whole of which it is a member; and it implies, moreover, the necessity of being joined to the whole in order to completeness in the nature of a member. Further, its connection with the whole must be both an inward and an outward connection, because its incompleteness as a member is internal as well as external. But if the above words are intended to convey both a fact and a principle, then we reply, first—that this principle contradicts the Anglican view, as set forth by *Tract XC.*; and, secondly—that collective and representative unity is not the unity which Christ destined for His Church. This was the unity of an organic body, and, therefore, an outward and visible unity, compacted in its joints, and culminating in a visible head. Now the paradigm of this perfect unity, given by our Blessed Lord Himself, is the unity of the most Holy Trinity, and of His own divine personality; and this unity, as we have shown above, must be centred in a person who is its root and source. According to the writer to whose doctrine we here address ourselves, the bishops are the source of unity in the Church; but, according to the Scripture and the Fathers, episcopal unity is to spring from the chair of St. Peter, in which the fulness of ecclesiastical jurisdiction is concentrated. It is, indeed, pitiable to see how the Tractarians strive to elude the evidence

of the Catholic demonstration, which arises from the language of St. Cyprian. In the Oxford translation of the treatises of that Father, the page bears the running title, "St. Peter is the principle of unity;" but in a foot-note we read that "each bishopric realises the oneness of the Church."[67] The mode of this realisation is explained in a note at the end of the treatise, wherein we are informed "that in theory there is one visible bishop, . . . each individual bishop being but a reiteration of every other." So that the conclusion is, "they (the Catholics) make St. Peter the real centre of unity; we the emphatic (*sic*) image and lesson of it; they make St. Peter's chair, the holy Roman see, a necessary instrument of grace; we a symbol, &c."[68] What inconsistency and confusion is here. The title asserts that, according to St. Cyprian's doctrine, St. Peter was the principle of unity; in the note, this is alleged to be an opinion only of the Romanists. Moreover, while it is true that the Episcopate, considered as an Order, is one, and that each bishop, in virtue of his consecration, enjoys an equal portion of it, it is also true that the whole Episcopate in union with Peter and his successors is one as regards ecclesiastical jurisdiction; because it is through union with Peter that this jurisdiction resides in its fulness in all the bishops, who by their union constitute the Church of Christ. But it is not true, as shall be shown hereafter, that each individual bishop is absolute and supreme over the whole flock of Christ, as if he were alone in the world.[69] We hope to lead the reader to see that they err who believe such a theory to be countenanced by apostolic teaching.

[67] *Treatises of St. Cyprian. Tract V.*, p. 134. In the Library of the Fathers, vol. iii., Oxford.

[68] *Ibid.*, p. 150.

[69] This is taught in the place last cited.

Were it so, there would be in the Church as many heads as bishops, with, of course, as many bodies as heads; and hence a state of confusion and disorder, which could never represent the unity of the most Holy Trinity and of the Incarnate Word of God.

SECTION II.

THE DIVINE INSTITUTION OF THE PRIMACY IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

MEMBERS both of the High and Low Church parties in England have ever understood that St. Peter's supremacy is the foundation of the authority of the Pope; that if a real primacy of jurisdiction over the other Apostles be once acknowledged as belonging to St. Peter, the authority of the Pope, as asserted by Catholics, would of necessity follow. Therefore, all Protestants, as well as the followers of Photius,[70] obstinately deny St. Peter's divine supremacy, that so they may be able consistently to reject the divinely conferred supremacy of his successors. Nevertheless, none of these refuse to St. Peter a primacy of Honour and Order, a pre-eminence of dignity among the Apostles; neither do they refuse such a pre-eminence to the Popes, but they refuse to extend to it a higher character than that of an eccle-

[70] Macarius: *Theolog. Dogm. orthod.*, t. ii., pt. 3, c. i., sec. 175.

siastical institution.[71] Andrewes,[72] Montague,[73] Bramhall,[74] Beveridge,[75] Barrow,[76] &c., held the same view, which has been adopted by modern divines of the English establishment—Bloomfield,[77] Palmer,[78] Alford,[79] Milman,[80] Browne,[81] &c.; and the Tractarians, with Dr. Pusey at their head, have not advanced one step in this matter. But as regards the passages of Scripture by which the Catholic doctrine of Peter's supremacy is proved, all do not take the same view. With regard to the principal passage in Matt. xvi., 18, a few, indeed, among recent English commentators, following in the steps of Beveridge, deny that the words of Christ refer to Peter.[82] Some, as Mr. Palmer and Dr. Browne, think

[71] Blondel says, "Protestantes neque apostolicæ cathedræ dignitatem unquam veteri Romæ denegasse, neque primatum, quem habet in vicinas Ecclesias, immo etiam quem aliqua ratione obtinet in universa, ita tamen ut Ecclesiastico juri dumtaxat id tribuant, quod pontifices divino jure ad se pertinere contendunt."—*De Primatu Papæ*, p. 24, (apud Ballerini, t. i., p. 17).

[72] Andrewes: *Respons. ad Apolog. Bellarmini*, c. i., p. 14. Edit. 1610.

[73] Montague: *Origines Eccles.* Pars posterior, p. 185.

[74] Bramhall: *Schism Guarded*, Discourse iv., sec. i., chs. i., x. xii., pp. 371-2, 468-9, 483; sec. viii., p. 609 (Works, vol. ii. Oxford).

[75] Beveridge: *On the Thirty-nine Articles* (Works, vol. vii., p. 580. Oxford).

[76] Barrow: *A Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy*, supp. i., p. 144, &c. (Works, vol. vii. London, 1831).

[77] Bloomfield: *Greek Testament.* Matt. xvi. 18, note p. 95, vol. i. London, 1839.

[78] Palmer: *On the Church of Christ*, pt. vii., c. i., vol. ii., p. 370, seq.

[79] Alford: *Greek Testament.* Note on Matt. xvi. 18, vol. i., p. 163.

[80] Milman: *History of the Latin Church*, bk. ii., c. i., vol. i., p. 80. London, 1857.

[81] Browne: *On the Thirty-nine Articles*, art. 37, sect. ii., p. 808, seq. London, 1856.

[82] We are not surprised that Wordsworth saw Christ only in the πέτρα of St. Matthew, for which, notwithstanding, he was

that it is doubtful whether they relate to Christ or to Peter, or to the faith in the divinity of Christ manifested by him; and that on this account it cannot afford ground for an article of faith.[83] Many, as Marsh, Bloomfield, Alford,[84] &c., moved by the authority of German interpreters, such as Fitscher, Kuinoel, Bengel,[85] &c., not only admit that the words "upon this rock" (ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ) should be understood of Peter, but think any other exposition strange, unnatural, and founded upon gratuitous suppositions. They, nevertheless, deny that by these words any supremacy of jurisdiction is implied. We will, therefore, attempt to show first, that these words most certainly apply to St. Peter, such being the unanimous persuasion of all antiquity; and, secondly, that by the terms employed concerning St. Peter, a primacy of jurisdiction is meant.

II. As regards the literal meaning of the words of St. Matthew, we have the warrant of many Protestants, both German and English, that the most natural and straightforward interpretation is that which refers the words "upon this rock" to Peter. Dr. Bloomfield writes as follows: "It is strange that it should have been passed over by any."[86] Now, if we consider the context of the chapter in question, any other literal interpretation will appear wholly inadmissible. St. Peter, enlightened by the Holy Ghost, makes the most solemn confession of faith in the divinity of Christ; in reward of which Christ

severely censured by Dean Alford (l. c.); but we are truly surprised that Dr. Burton, a writer of no small repute among the High Church party, thinks that Christ, in the above-mentioned passage, told all the Apostles that they are the rock on which He intended to build His Church. (*Greek Test.*, note on Matt., l. c.) Dr. Burton is evidently afraid of the *consequences* of the common explanation.

[83] Palmer: l. c., p. 373. Browne: l. c., pp. 806-7.

[84] Bloomfield and Alford: Note on Matt. xvi. 18.

[85] See their *Commentaries* on Matt. xvi. 18.

[86] Bloomfield: l. c.

bestows on him a magnificent encomium: calls him blessed with heavenly blessedness (μακάριος); and professes His purpose of bestowing a proportionate reward, in correspondence with the sublimity of his faith. "And I also say unto thee," Κἀγὼ δὲ σοὶ λέγω, Christ replies with full authority, as the Lord of heaven and earth, as the Son of God, according to St. Peter's solemn proclamation. It was then most fitting that He should use words of an import adapted to express not only the reward bestowed on Peter's confession, but also His own power and Godhead. Now, according to the Protestant interpretation, which we are combating, after that solemn introduction, "And I also say unto thee," Christ would only have said to Peter that he was *Cephas* (Πέτρος); that is, merely repeated to him what He had already announced long before, when He promised to change his name into that of *Cephas*.[87] Nay, more, He would only be repeating the very fulfilment of that promise;[88] and further still, He would be warning St. Peter that the new name bestowed upon him had no office, no dignity whatever, connected with it; that Himself was the rock, on which His Church was to be built, while Peter himself was nothing. Who does not see the untenable character of this interpretation, which Canon Wordsworth, and those who sympathise with him in his views, have so strenuously maintained?[89] On the

[87] John i. 42. Σὺ εἶ Σίμων ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωνᾶ, σὺ κληθήσῃ Κηφᾶς ὃ ἑρμηνεύεται Πέτρος.

[88] Mark iii. 16. Καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρον.

[89] We do not dwell upon the common difficulties urged by some Protestants of the old school, founded on the difference between πέτρος and πέτρα in the above passage. It would have equal force against the interpretation which we are combating; and it has been moreover frequently refuted, not only by Catholic but even by Protestant critics; for instance, Rosenmüller, Michaelis, Kuinoel, Bengel, and others.

contrary, how natural, how reasonable, and how necessary, is the interpretation which every Catholic advocates? What Christ expressed so solemnly by the words "Κἀγὼ δὲ σοὶ λέγω," And I also say unto thee, was meant to correspond with what had been as solemnly said by Peter in the words "Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος," Thou art Christ the son of the living God. So that as Peter had been the first among the Apostles to proclaim solemnly, under an especial influence of the Holy Ghost, the divinity of Christ, in like manner Christ appointed him to be the rock on which He would build His Church. In this view, all the passages which refer to the new name of Simon the son of Jona, are seen to be in admirable harmony. As soon as Simon was presented to Christ by Andrew, his brother, our Lord, who well knew his destiny, and what was the office and the character for which he was to be chosen, gave a promise to change his name into that of *Cephas.* When the number of the Twelve was completed, He gave him that name; but He did not promise him the office and the character to which it had reference, before having obtained from him a solemn and public confession of His Divinity. Still, although Peter by a prophetic name, and by an explicit promise of an eminent office, had been designated by Christ to be the head and the ruler of His Church; yet Christ, as long as He remained on earth, did not invest him with the high dignity of œcumenical pastor, since Peter was not to be Christ's vicar and the visible head of the Church, until Christ had left this world and gone to His Father. Now, to return to our main point, both the literal sense of the words of Matthew, and the context, no less than the harmony of the Gospels on this point, unquestionably prove that the words of Christ, "Upon this rock I will build My Church," are necessarily to be understood of Peter.

III. Mr. Palmer, Dr. Browne, and other modern English writers, make no allusion to the literal sense of the above passage, nor to the context. They strive rather to throw doubt and uncertainty over the true and manifest meaning; and on this account they contend that the Fathers, by their conflicting explanations of the above words, have sufficiently proved the uncertainty of their purport. Now we absolutely deny the existence of such a conflict among the Fathers. In the first five centuries of the Church there are at least twenty-seven Fathers who understand Peter to be the rock on which the Church was built; that is to say, more than the High Church party could appeal to in support of any other doctrine whatever. Mr. Palmer, on the authority of Du Pin and Natalis Alexander, mentions fourteen only of these. They are Tertullian, Origen, St. Cyprian, St. Hilary, St. Basil, St. Ambrose, St. Epiphanius, St. Jerome, St. Augustin, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Leo, St. Maximus, Theophylact, and Euthymius. But we add to this number at least thirteen others, whose words will be found at the foot of pp. 34—6. They are St. Firmilian,[90] St. James of Nisibis, who was present at the Council of Nice,[91] St. Ephrem,[92] St. Gregory of Nyssa,[93] St. Pacian,[94] Caius

[90] Firmilianus: *Epist. ad Cyprianum* (inter Epist. S. Cypr., lxxv. Edit. Balutii, p. 148). "Super quem Petrum fundamenta Ecclesiæ collocata sunt."

[91] Jacobus Episcopus Nisib.: *Serm.* vii., n. vi. "Suscepit eum (Petrum) Dominus noster, fecitque illum fundamentum et vocavit eum petram ædificii Ecclesiæ." (Gallandi, t. v., p. lvi.-vii. See also *Serm.* i., n. xiii., p. ix., and *Serm.* xi., n. xii., p. lxxxiv.)

[92] S. Ephrem Syrus: *Serm.* xiii. (inter Sermones Syriacos, t. ii. Edit. Rom., p. 433-34). "Suscepit nimirum lapides qui suam ædificaturus erat Ecclesiam super Cepham."

[93] S. Greg. Nyss: *Laudatio* ii. *in Stephanum.* οὗτος γάρ ἐστι κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου δωρεὰν ἡ ἀρραγὴς,

Marius Victorinus,[95] St. John Chrysostom,[96] St. Asterius,[97] Paul Orosius,[98] Boniface I.,[99] Felix III.,[100] Pseudo-Ambrosius,[101] and Gelasius.[102] In a word, in addition

καὶ ὀχυρωτάτη πέτρα ἐφ' ἣν τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ὁ Σωτὴρ ᾠκοδόμησε. (Penes Gallandi, t. vi., p. 600.)

[94] S. Pacianus: *Epist.* iii., n. ii. (Gallandi, t. vii., p. 265). "Ipso referente Matthæo, paullo superius ad Petrum loquutus est Dominus; ad unum, ideo ut unitatem fundaret ex uno; mox id ipsum in commune præcipiens qualiter tamen ad Petrum incipit: Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram," etc.

[95] Caius Marius Victorinus: In Epist. ad Galat., i. 18. "Si in Petro fundamentum Ecclesiæ positum est, ut in Evangelio dictum; cui revelata erant omnia Paulus scivit videre se debere Petrum; quasi eum cui tanta auctoritas a Christo data esset, non ut ab eo aliquid disceret." (Mai., *Script. Vet. Nova Collectio*, t. iii., pt. ii., p. 9.)

[96] S. Chrysostomus: *Hom. in illud, Hoc Scitote*, n. 4. (Op., t. vi. Edit. Maur, p. 282). Πέτρος ὁ κορυφαῖος τοῦ χοροῦ, τὸ στόμα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἁπάντων, ἡ κεφαλὴ τῆς φρατρίας ἐκείνης, ὁ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἁπάσης προστάτης, ὁ θεμέλιος τῆς ἐκκλησίας. See also *Hom.* iii., *De Poenit*, n. 4 (Op., t. ii., p. 300).

[97] S. Asterius Amasenus: *Hom.* viii., *in SS. Petrum et Paulum* (Edit. Migne, PP. Gracci., t. xl., p. 267). Ὁ δὲ Μονογενὴς πάλιν, καθὼς ἐν Εὐαγγελίοις φησὶν Θεμέλιον τὸν Πέτρον ὀνομάζει τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ.

[98] Paulus Orosius: *L. de Arbitrii Libertate*, n. 23. (Edit. Migne, PP. LL., t. xxxi., p. 1192.) "Testimonio dilectionis Domini (Petrus) nunc petra fundamenti Ecclesiæ constituitur." "O Petre supra quam petram Christus suam fundavit Ecclesiam."—n. 27 (l. c., p. 1195), n. 30 (l. c., p. 1199), &c.

[99] Bonifacius I.: *Epist.* v., n. i. (Coustant., *Epist. RR. PP.*, p. 1022). "Neque potest tibi esse non proximus (Petius), qui pastor dominicarum ovium est perpetuus constitutus; aut aliquam ubivis positam Ecclesiam non curare *in quo universalis Ecclesiæ positum legimus fundamentum.*"

[100] Felix III.: *Epist.* xii., *ad Zenonem Sup.* (Labbe, Acta Conc., t. v. Edit. Venetiis, p. 208). "Summum Apostolorum B. Petrum et Petram fidei esse." See also *Epist.* v., *ad eundem Zenonem* (l. c., p. 164, seq.).

[101] Pseudo-Ambrosius: *Sermo.* xliv., n. 3 (In Op. S. Ambrosii. Edit. Maur, t. ii., p. 499). "Pro hac devotione dicitur Petro: Beatus es

to the obvious meaning of the words themselves, we have, in favour of that meaning, all the Fathers and Doctors of antiquity, who, without exception, bear the same witness to the traditional sense—throughout the Catholic Church—of the words of Christ. Where, then, do we see any trace of a conflict between the interpretations, as given by the Fathers, of this passage of St. Matthew? Mr. Palmer and his friends, on the authority of Du Pin, reply that many Fathers understood the rock to mean our Lord; others, the true faith; and others, the Apostles collectively. But Mr. Palmer supposes that those Fathers intended to give their interpretations as being the literal sense of the words of Christ. If such is his opinion, he does a great injustice to the Fathers, by supposing them to have adopted a strange, an unnatural, a distorted, a fanciful interpretation; for such are the terms which Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Bengel, Bloomfield, Alford, and others, apply to these various interpretations; and, moreover, by falsely representing them as guilty of self-contradiction: for all the Fathers who, before the sixth century, seem to have adopted any of the above-mentioned interpretations, referred the *rock* literally to St. Peter. As is done, for instance, by Origen, Hilary, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Leo, &c. Our adversaries cannot deny the fact, as it results even from the bare comparison of the lists of names subjoined by them to each of the above-mentioned opinions. Now, if those very Fathers who understood the rock either of Christ, or of St. Peter's

Simon Barjona, etc. Recte igitur quia petra Christus, Simon nuncupatus est Petrus; ut qui cum Domino fidei societatem habebat, cum Domino haberet et nominis Dominici unitatem: ut sicut a Christo Christianus dicitur, ita a petra Christo Petrus Apostolus vocatur."

[102] Gelasius I.: *Epist.* xiv., *sive Tractatus.* (Labbe, t. v., p. 341).

faith and confession,[103] are to be found maintaining the obvious reference of the rock to St. Peter, it manifestly follows that, in proposing that collateral, mediate, and indirect exposition, they did not forget the immediate, original, and traditional interpretation of the *rock*, ever maintained by the Church Catholic. But further, the literal interpretation which refers the *rock* to St. Peter, so far from excluding the other interpretations given above, is perfectly consistent with them. Nay, all these interpretations, if we put them together, supply us with the complete and full meaning of Christ's words ; for St. Peter was, it is true, appointed the rock on which the Church was to be built, but he was not to be the principal, the original rock, from which the Church was to derive its internal strength. Peter was not himself to be the *rock*: "That rock was Christ," according to the words of the Apostle ; and "other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ."[104] Peter was to be the rock of the Church, but secondarily to Christ, from whom the Church was to receive its stability. Yet he was to be the outward and visible rock, whilst Christ was the inward and invisible foundation. For the secondary and visible rock cannot be conceived without the primary foundation. Moreover, faith, and faith in Christ, is the principle which constitutes Christ's Church. Therefore, Peter was appointed to be the rock of the Church, on account of his faith in, and public confession of, the divinity of Christ. In other words, our Lord founded His Church upon Peter, who had solemnly professed his faith in His divinity. Peter, then, is the rock, because he represents—and, in a manner, embodies—the principle of faith in Christ.

[103] In the course of this Section we will show that by the term "rock" we must not understand all the Apostles.

[104] 1 Cor. iii. 11 ; x. 4.

On this account, some of the Fathers, whilst taking the rock in its literal sense, at the same time say also that faith in Christ, or public confession of this faith, is the rock of the Church. These interpretations, far from being incompatible, rather are naturally implied each in the other, and serve to bring out the full import of the words of Christ. What wonder, then, if in the fourth and fifth centuries, when Arianism impugned the divinity of Christ, and attempted to shake the rock of the Church, the Fathers lifted up their voice, and denounced the heretics as destroyers of the Church—for the Church, as they teach, is built on the rock of Christ, on the confession of His divinity? In speaking thus, they did not reject the literal sense handed down by the tradition of the first three centuries, which they themselves had already repeatedly set forth in their writings. But in opposing the Arian heresy and its offshoots, they preferred to aim a blow against it by the use of the mediate, indirect, and relative interpretation. A few passages of the Fathers will serve to confirm our statement.

IV. Indeed, the Fathers expressly distinguish between the primary and the secondary rock on which the Church is founded. "On this rock," says St. Jerome, "the Lord founded the Church; from this rock the Apostle, St. Peter, obtained his name. . . . The foundation which the Apostle, as an architect, laid down, is none other than our Lord Jesus Christ. On that foundation, firmly set in its own massive strength, the Church is built."[105] Now this passage of St. Jerome by

[105] S. Hieronymus: l. iii., *Comm.* in Matt. vii. 25, 26 (Op., t. vii. Edit. Vallarsii, p. 42). "Super hanc petram Dominus fundavit Ecclesiam, ab hac petra Apostolus Petrus sortitus est nomen . . . fundamentum quod Apostolus Architectus posuit, unus est Dominus noster J. C. Super hoc fundamentum stabile et firmum et per se robusta mole fundatum, ædificatur Christi Ecclesia."

no means implies the exclusion, but, rather, the development of another passage in the same commentary, where he says: "To Simon, who believed on the rock —which is Christ—was given the name of Peter. And, in accordance with the metaphor of a rock, is it justly said to him, 'I will build My Church upon thee.'"[106] In both these passages the doctrine is the same: Christ is represented as the fundamental rock of the Church, the rock which draws its strength from itself. But still it is stated that the Church is built on St. Peter; that St. Peter was the rock of the Church, but not the independent rock—not the rock solid and massive in its own strength, but the rock which owes its stability to the fundamental rock on which it rests. The doctrine of the other Fathers is in perfect harmony with that of St. Jerome. "Although," says St. Basil, "Peter is the rock, he is not the rock as Peter; for Christ is really the unshaken rock (Χριστὸς γὰρ ὄντως πέτρα ἀσάλευτος), but Peter by reason of the rock (πέτρος δὲ διὰ τὴν πέτραν). Because Christ bestows His gifts, not as parting with, but retaining what he bestows."[107] St. Gregory of Nyssa expresses the same view when saying that Simon "was perfected by faith, and having cleaved to the rock, became a rock" (ἐτελειώθη διὰ τῆς πίστεως, καὶ προσφυσὶς τῇ πέτρᾳ πέτρος ἐγένετο).[108] The same is the sentiment of Asterius: "He (Christ) who is truly the first, was cast

[106] S. Hieronymus: In Matt. xvi. 18, p. 124.

[107] S. Basilius: *Hom. de Poenit*, n. 4 (Op., t. ii. Edit. Maur, Parisiis, 1722, p. 606). Although Garnier and Tillemont doubt whether this homily is to be ascribed to St. Basil, yet many critics consider it genuine; and Garnier himself maintains that it must have been written by some cotemporary bishop against the Novatians and Montanists. (See preface in t. ii., Op. S. Basilii, sec. vi., p. xviii.)

[108] St. Gregory Nyss.: *Hom.* xv. *in Cant. Cantic* (Op., t. i. Edit. Migne, p. 1088).

down, as some vast and strong stone, into the hollow of this world; or, as David says, into this vale of tears. . . . But with a like appellation did our Saviour also adorn that first of His disciples, denominating him the rock of the faith."[109] The same is inculcated by St. Ambrose: "Christ," he says, "is the rock . . . but He did not refuse to bestow this title even upon His disciple, so that he, too, might be Peter, on account of deriving from the rock solid constancy and firmness of faith."[110] All the Fathers speak in the same sense when they understand the rock to mean St. Peter's faith. Without faith in the divinity of Christ, Simon would not have become Peter, the rock of the Church. Therefore, the faith and the confession of St. Peter are the true rock of the Church; and on this account the Fathers, even in the Council of Ephesus, call St. Peter the rock and pillar of the Church, the rock and pillar of the confession; and for that reason they say that Christ laid the foundation of the Church on the confession of St. Peter.[111] This explanation may be confirmed by the words of the author of the first sermon on Pentecost, who, speaking of the Church, says: "Christ did not build upon a man, but upon his faith."[112] Neither does the doctrine of St. Augustin, if looked at in its true light, differ from that common to all antiquity. In fact, he says: "Rock is a principal name; therefore,

[109] S. Asterius: l. c.

[110] S. Ambrosius: *Exposit. in Lucam*, l. vi., n. 97 (Op., t. i., Edit. Maur, Parisiis, p. 1407).

[111] These words are of St. Chrysostom. *Hom.* lxxxii. al. lxxxiii. in Matt., n. 3. Edit. Maur (Op., t. vii., p. 786), and in I. Epist. ad Galat., n. i. (t. x., Op., p. 657). The same Doctor had called Peter rock of the faith, &c., as in *Hom. de Deb. decem Talent*, n. 3 (t. iii., Op., p. 4), and in *Hom. Contra Ludos*, n. i. (t. vi. Op., p. 273). For the passages of the other Fathers, see Ballerini, *De vi et ratione Primatus*, t. i., c. xii., sec. i., p. 67, seq. Edit. 1770.

[112] *Sermo* i. *in Pentec.* (in t. iii. Op. S. Chrysostomi, p. 790).

Peter is denominated from the rock (*Petrus a petra*), not the rock from Peter (*non Petra a Petro*). . . . 'Thou art Peter,' said Christ, 'and on the rock which thou didst acknowledge when saying, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," I will build My Church.'" That is to say: I will build My Church upon faith in the Son of the living God; I will build thee upon Myself, not Myself upon thee.[113] Thus St. Augustin, with all the other Fathers, acknowledges—1. That Peter, by his name, derives his strength and firmness from Christ, who of Himself is the true and self-subsisting rock. 2. That the first foundation of the Church is Christ, not Peter. 3. That Peter became the rock of the Church by being founded on Christ, and by the public confession of His divinity. Now, the doctrine of Peter being the head of the Church rests upon these three points; the doctrine which the Catholic Church has ever taught, and which she will teach till the end of the world. Innocent III. summarily expresses it in the most explicit terms. "Although," says he, "the first and principal foundation of the Church be the Only-begotten Son of God, Jesus Christ, according to the Apostle (1 Cor. iii. 2), yet the other, and secondary foundation of the Church, is Peter."[114] But, moreover, what doubt can there be about the mode in which the word rock must be taken in the text under consideration, when the Universal Church has invariably and solemnly declared that she understands it of St. Peter? In two Councils—those of Ephesus and Chalcedon—the literal interpretation was assumed as true without the least contradiction. In the Council of Ephesus, Philip, the legate of the Roman see, openly asserts that, "St. Peter is the prince and the head of the Apostles,

[113] S. Augustinus: *Serm.* lxxvi., n. i. (Op., t. v., Edit. Maur, p. 290.)

[114] Innocentius III.: *Epist.* ccix. Reg., l. ii., Pontific, an. ii., A.D. 1198.

the pillar of the faith, the foundation of the Catholic Church."[115] And in the Council of Chalcedon, Paschasinus and Lucentius, the papal legates, made the same declaration, calling St. Peter, "the rock and groundwork of the Catholic Church, and the foundation of the orthodox faith."[116] Moreover, the rock is understood of Peter in the well-known formulary of faith set forth by Pope Hormisdas to the Eastern Church after the schism of Acacius.[117] This formulary was received and signed by all the patriarchs and bishops of the Oriental Church; and in the Eighth Œcumenical Council it was again confirmed by all the Fathers, both of the Latin and Greek Churches.[118] So that, as Bossuet remarks, that formulary may be said to be sanctioned by the whole Catholic world.[119] In the face of all this evidence, how can Mr. Palmer, Dr. Browne, and their followers, believe it to be "proved incontestably that the Church has not received any certain Apostolical tradition as to the meaning of this part of the text?" (Matt. xvi. 18).[120]

[115] (Labbe, t. iii., *Conc. Eph.*, act. iii. Edit. Venetüs, p. 1153.) Πέτρος ὁ ἔξαρχος καὶ κεφαλὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὁ κίων τῆς πίστεως, ὁ θεμέλιος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας.

[116] Ὃς (Πέτρος) ἐστι πέτρα καὶ κρηπὶς τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ τῆς ὀρθοδόξης πίστεως ὁ θεμέλιος. (Labbe, t. iv., *Conc. Chalced.*, act. iii., p. 1305.)

[117] "Non potest D. N. J. C. prætermitti sententia dicentis: Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam." (Labbe, t. v., in libello Joan. Episc. Const. ad Hormisdam, p. 622.) Denzinger, Enchiridion. Edit. 1865, p. 49.

[118] *Conc.* viii. *Œcum.*, act. i. (Labbe, t. x., p. 497.)

[119] Bossuet: *Defensio Decl. Cleri Gallicani*, pt. ii., l. xv., c. vii., p. 338, t. ii. Edit. Basil., 1733. "Hæc professio fidei ab Hormisda Pontifice sic data ab omnibus Episcopis Orientalibus, eorumque antesignanis Constantinopolitanis Patriarchis est recepta. Qua de re Occidentales Episcopi, præsertim Gallicani, multum in Domino collætantur, ut certum sit, hanc formulam a tota Ecclesia Catholica comprobatam."

[120] Palmer: *Treatise on the Church of Christ*, vol. ii., l. c., p. 375. Browne: Op. cit., l. c., p. 808.

V. Mr. Palmer, however, following in the footsteps of Bloomfield, Rosenmüller, Bengel, Kuinoel, &c., in order to get rid of the difficulty, adduces a new interpretation. He thinks that, "St. Peter was the rock on which the Church was founded, because he was the first who professed his faith in Christ, and who first preached to the Jews," &c.[121] Now, the first reason given by Mr. Palmer in support of his opinion amounts to this: Christ, in order to reward the faith of Peter, who was the first to believe in His divinity, appointed him a rock—that is to say, the first who believed in His divinity. *Idem per idem.* But on what grounds is it asserted that the *rock* implies only that St. Peter was to be the first to preach to the Jews? Their interpretation is said to be suggested by the authority of the Pseudo-Ambrose, and of Tertullian, in a passage written after he had fallen into the Montanist heresy. But even if those two ancient writers had ventured on such an interpretation, what weight would their authority have had in comparison with all Catholic antiquity, which knows nothing of it? Besides, we need not allow ourselves to be moved by the words of Tertullian, when, in the Book *De Pudicitia* (c. xxj.) he says that the Church was built through Peter, not on Peter; for this same Tertullian, while yet a Catholic, and even after his fall, often stated that the Church was built on St. Peter, not through him.[122] Moreover, Tertullian, in the above-quoted passage, intends to defend the capital error of his sect; and, therefore, he —no less than the Anglicans, both of the High and of

[121] Palmer: l. c., p. 376.

[122] *De Præscript.*, c. xxii., t. ii., Op. Edit. Migne, p. 34. *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iv., c. xiii., Op., t. ii., p. 387. And in the very book, *De Monogomia*, written by him when a Montanist (c. viii., t. ii., p. 939), he says: "Ecclesia supra illum ædificata est."

the Low Church at the present day—was in the same necessity of repudiating the primacy of St. Peter in order to justify his schism and heresy. But what shall we say with regard to the passage alleged from the Pseudo-Ambrose?—We say: 1. That it is not of Pseudo-Ambrose, but of St. Maximus Taurinensis. Had Mr. Palmer looked at the works of St. Ambrose, edited by the learned Benedictines of St. Maur, or at the splendid edition of the writings of St. Maximus published by Pope Pius VI., he would have found the words he has quoted.[123] 2. We may say that the passage cited by Mr. Palmer is a patent proof of the real primacy of St. Peter, and as such it was quoted by Pius VI. himself in his dedicatory preface, addressed to the King of Sardinia.[124] In fact, our adversaries quote the first part only of that passage, and thus distort its meaning. St. Maximus says: "St. Peter, on account of the solidity of his steadfastness (to Christ) is called the rock of the Church, as our Lord declares, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church.' For he is called rock, because he was the first to lay the foundations of the faith among the nations, and because, like a universal rock, he binds together (or encloses) the compacted mass of the whole structure of Christianity. Peter, therefore, is called a rock on account of his steadfastness; while the Lord is called a rock on account of His power."[125] Now this

[123] S. Maximus Taurinensis Episc.: *Hom. Hiemal*, hom. liv. *de S. Petro Apost.*, p. 169. Romæ, 1784.—The Maurists put only the title of that sermon in the *Index Sermonum prætermissorum.* (Op. St. Ambrosii, t. ii., App., p. 378.)

[124] Op. cit., p. iv.

[125] "Petrus pro soliditate devotionis Ecclesiarum petra dicitur, sicut ait Dominus: tu es Petrus et super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam. Petra enim dicitur, eo quod primus in nationibus fidei fundamenta posuerit, et tanquam saxum immobile totius operis

passage contains three parts; Mr. Palmer and his friends quote the second only, detached from the context, and thus have falsified its meaning. St. Maximus says: "Peter is called a rock, because he was the first to lay the foundations of the faith among the nations;" and Mr. Palmer, who, with Bloomfield and Alford, followed in the footsteps of the Rationalists of Germany, explains the denomination given to Peter by his being the first preacher to the Jews, as well as to the Gentiles. But the text under consideration has an entirely different purport. St. Maximus, after mentioning the great grace which St. Peter received when, "As a good shepherd, he received the flock in his keeping . . and became the support of all men, so as to be able by the firmness of his faith to establish the rest," proceeds to explain the reason for which he was gifted with such a privilege, and he discovers it in the depth of his devotedness to Christ, for which, he says, he was called the rock of the Church. But what is the meaning of that designation? St. Maximus says that it implies two things: (1.) St. Peter's public confession of the divinity of Christ, for this, being the first made to the world, was the foundation of the Church, which rests on the faith of Christ's divinity; (2.) his supremacy, by which, "*like a universal rock, he binds together the compacted mass of the whole structure of Christianity.*" That is to say, St. Peter, whilst he gave a beginning to the Church by his public profession of faith in Christ's divinity, became, by the favour of Christ, the centre and stay of unity in the Universal Church. Therefore, the doctrine of St. Maximus is in accordance with that of all the Fathers, and declares evidently the supremacy

Christiani compaginem molemque contineat. Petra autem pro devotione Petrus dicitur et petra pro virtute Dominus nuncupatur."—l. c.

of St. Peter. But that Anglicans may have a still stronger proof of this, we invite them to read the following words of St. Maximus, *Sermon* lxxxix.: "Our Lord," he says, "entered the one boat of the Church, in which Peter was appointed the pilot, when He said, 'On this rock I will build My Church.'"[126] Thus, according to the doctrine of St. Maximus, when Christ said to St. Peter, "On this rock," &c., He intended to appoint Peter the pilot, or supreme ruler of the Church. He intended to entrust to him the helm of the whole Church, as he speaks in another sermon.[127] So that, in the universal perdition of the world, they only will be saved who are received into the bark of St. Peter.[128]

VI. From all this, we may conclude that the above-mentioned interpretation given to the *rock* by the Rationalists of Germany, and the High Church party of England, was unknown to antiquity, and rests only on the fancy of those who first devised it. On the contrary, the Catholic interpretation of the *rock*, which implies St. Peter's primacy, is not only supported, as we have seen, by St. Maximus, but by the concurrent voice of all ancient Catholic writers; since all assign this sense to the words addressed to St. Peter by our Lord. And the Fathers undeniably teach that by the Church being built upon St. Peter, Christ set forth the origin of unity. So St. Cyprian.[129] "That St. Peter,

[126] "Hanc igitur solam Ecclesiæ navem ascendit Dominus, in qua Petrus Magister est constitutus, dicente Domino: Super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam."—*Serm.* lxxxix. *de Diversis*, p. 641.

[127] "Quantum igitur meriti apud Deum suum Petrus erat ut ei post naviculæ parvæ remigium, totius Ecclesiæ gubernacula traderentur?"—*Serm.* lxx., p. 225. Edit. cit.

[128] "Quæ navis in altum sæculi ita natat ut pereunte mundo, omnes quas suscipit, servet illæsos."—*Serm.* lxxxix., l. c.

[129] S. Cyprianus: *Epist.* lxxiii. Edit. Baluz., p. 131.

through the superiority of his faith, received on himself the building of the Church." So St. Basil too.[130] "That since Christ told Peter, 'On this rock I will build My Church,' where Peter is, there is the Church, where the Church is, there is no death, but eternal life." Thus St. Ambrose.[131] Moreover, the Fathers considered the name of rock given to Peter in connection with the stability and strength which accrues to the Church from that foundation; and this is in accordance with what Christ says in the same place: "And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." In this sense St. Peter is styled by St. Hilary, the "happy foundation of the Church, and rock worthy of the building of that which was to destroy the rule of hell and the infernal gates, and all the bars of death."[132] St. Epiphanius calls him, "the first of the Apostles, that firm rock upon which the Church of God is built, and against which the gates of hell shall not prevail: The gates of hell are heretics and heresies."[133] In the same spirit, St. Asterius, after having said that Christ called Peter rock of the faith, adds: "Through Peter, who became a genuine and faithful doctor of religion, the stability of the Church is preserved incapable of fall and unswerving. . . . Nothing was seen to be more powerful than the bulwark set up by God,

[130] S. Basilius: *Adv. Eunomium*, l. ii., n. 4 (Op., t. i., p. 240. Edit. Maur).

[131] S. Ambrosius: In Ps. xl., n. 30 (Op., t. i., p. 879. Edit. Maur). "Ubi Petrus ibi et Ecclesia."

[132] S. Hilarius: *Comm.* in S. Matt. xvi., n. 7. Edit. Maur, p. 749.

[133] S. Epiphanius: *In Anchorato*, n. 9 (Op., t. ii. Edit. Petavii, p. 14). See also *Origenes penes Eusebium H. E.*, l. vi., c. xxv. Edit. Valesii, p. 227. Greg. Nyss.: *Orat. de S. Stephano* (penes Gallandi, t. vi., p. 600). S. Hieronymus: l. i., *contra Pelagianos*, n. 14 (Op., t. ii., p. 707). S. Chrysost.: *Homil.* liv. al. lv. in Matt., n. 2 (Op., t. vii., p. 547, seq).

because it is the edifice of the faith which had been built by the holy hands of the first of the Apostles."[134] St. Avitus,[135] and many other Fathers, speak in the same manner. Finally, Caius Marius Victorinus, inquiring into the cause why St. Paul went up to Jerusalem in order to see St. Peter, says: "For if the foundation of the Church was laid on Peter, as is said in the Gospel, Paul knew—for all things had been revealed to him—that he ought to see Peter, as one to whom so great authority had been given by Christ; not as though he could learn anything from him."[136] St. Chrysostom speaks in the same sense of the name given by Christ to His disciple, "A name of power and authority which was to represent the office with which he was to be invested."[137] It is then unquestionable that, according to the judgment of all antiquity, St. Peter, in virtue of his being called the *rock*, became the centre of unity in the whole Church, the source of its power and strength, the ruler of the whole body, with full authority even over all the princes of the Church. Nor does St. Peter's supremacy imply anything more than this. Thus the objections of the

[134] S. Asterius: *Hom.* viii., *in SS. Petrum et Paulum* (Edit. Migne, t. xl., PP. Graec., p. 268-69).

[135] S. Avitus: *Fragm.* i. (in Gallandi, t. x., p. 746).

[136] Victorinus: *In Epist. ad Galat.*, i. 15 (penes Mai, Scrip. Vet. Nov. Collec., t. iii., pt. ii., p. 9). "Si in Petro fundamentum Ecclesiæ positum est, ut in Evangelio dictum, cui revelata erant omnia, Paulus scivit videre se debere Petrum, quasi eum, cui tanta auctoritas a Christo data esset, non ut ab eo aliquid disceret."

[137] Οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν (Joa. i. 24.), Ἐγώ σε μετονομάσω Πέτρον, καὶ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἐπὶ τῇ πέτρᾳ ταύτῃ, ἀλλὰ σὺ κληθήσῃ Κηφᾶς. Ἐκεῖνο γὰρ αὐθεντίας ἦν καὶ ἐξουσίας μείζονος. Ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς οὐκ εὐθέως οὐδὲ ἐξ ἀρχῆν τὰ τῆς ἐξουσίας ἐπιδείκνυται πάντα ἀλλὰ τέως ταπεινότερον φθέγγεται . . . . ἀπὸ τῶν πραγμάτων τὰ ὀνόματα τίθεσθαι ὅπερ δήπου καὶ Ἠλίας πεποίηκε.—S. Chrys: *Hom.* xviii. al. xix. in Joan., n. 2 (Op., t. viii. Edit. Maur, p. 112-13).

Anglicans, and all who agree with them, against Peter's supremacy, as established by the text of St. Matt. xvi. 18, come to naught. And this is the more clear since the Fathers give the denomination of *rock*, as well as that of head of the Church, promiscuously to St. Peter, deriving this designation from the image of the human body by which the Church is represented. "The Church," says St. Jerome, "is founded upon Peter, although, in another place, this selfsame thing is said of all the Apostles . . . nevertheless, for this reason, out of the twelve one is selected, that by the appointment of a head the occasion of schism may be removed."[138] St. Peter, then, by being appointed the rock of the Church, was constituted its head, as the centre and stay of its unity. The other Fathers hold the same view,[139] and the Council of Ephesus itself allowed the Legate of the Holy See to call St. Peter, not only the rock, but the head of the Apostles (κεφαλὴ τῶν Ἀποστόλων).[140]

VII. But it is not only on the words of St. Matthew xvi. 18, that we rest the supremacy of St. Peter and his successors. The nineteenth verse of the same chapter, and the other two classical texts in St. John xxi. 15—17, and St. Luke xxii. 31, 32, afford the most solid and evident demonstration of our doctrines. But as we do not intend to write a treatise on this subject, we cannot dwell at length on each of these passages; we shall therefore confine ourselves to a few short remarks on each point. Now, as regards the passage of St. Matthew xvi. 19, it is evident that Christ our

[138] S. Hieron.: *Adv. Jov.*, l. i., n. 26, p. 279 (Op., t. ii. Edit. Vallarsii).

[139] S. Optatus Mil.: *De Schism. Donat.*, l. ii., c. ii. "In qua (cathedra) sederit omnium Apostolorum caput Petrus."—Edit. Migne, p. 947.

[140] *Conc. Ephes.*, act. iii. (Labbe, t. iii, l. c.).

Lord addressed to Peter these words: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." Christ had told Peter in the preceding verse that He would build His Church upon him, as upon an immovable rock; He now confers on him, under another image, the same power and authority—or, rather, He invests him with the supreme and monarchical office closely connected with his supremacy in the Church. Now, a *key* has always been considered a symbol of power and authority; and therefore, the presentation of a key to a person was the recognised form of investing him with that power and authority.[141] He who possesses the key has the power of admitting into the house, and excluding therefrom, and hence is the master of the house. God spoke of Christ by the prophet Isaias: "The key of the house of David I lay upon His shoulders: He shall open, and none shall shut; and He shall shut, and none shall open."[142] In the Apocalypse, Christ is called, "He that has the keys of David: He that opens, and no man shuts; and shuts, and no man opens."[143] Now, if we compare these two passages with another of Isaias where he says, "The government shall be upon His shoulder,"[144] we shall easily understand that the key on Christ's shoulder means His supreme and ruling authority over that kingdom which was given to Him by His Divine Father. St. Peter was endowed by Christ with the same power in the Church. Thus

[141] This principle is fully acknowledged by Dr. Bloomfield in his note on St. Matt. xvi. 19, p. 99. Edit. cit. And with him are all the learned Protestants.

[142] Isaias xxii. 22.

[143] Apoc. iii. 7.

[144] Isaias ix. 6.

Christ, being the primary and original rock of the Church, communicated to His disciple the solidity of that rock, that Peter might become the foundation of the Church. Christ possessed in His own right the key, as badge of supreme rule in the Church, and He shared His own authority with His disciple, that Peter might be the visible and outward ruler of the Church, of which Christ, remaining in heaven, was to be the invisible and inward governor; that Peter might govern the Church as vicar and representative of Christ, whilst Christ was to govern it as its Lord and God. Now the Fathers are unanimous in asserting that in the above-quoted passage, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, with the power of binding and loosing in heaven and on earth, were given to Peter directly and immediately. "Remember," says Tertullian, "that the Lord in this place left the keys of heaven to Peter, and, through him, to the Church."[145] Optatus of Milevis likewise expresses the same doctrine: "Blessed Peter," he says, "both merited to be preferred before all the Apostles, and alone received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, *that he might communicate them to the rest.*[146] Neither does St. Augustin enunciate a different doctrine when he says: "Some passages are found which seem to relate to Peter, but which, nevertheless, have no clear meaning, unless by reference to the Church, of which he is acknowledged to have been the personification in figure, on account of the primacy which he had amongst the

[145] Tertullianus: *Scorpiace*, c. x. Edit. Migne, p. 142 (Op., t. ii.). "Memento claves ejus (cœli) hic Dominum Petro, et per eum Ecclesiæ reliquisse."—See also *De Præscript*, c. xxii. (t. ii., Op., p. 34).

[146] S. Optatus Mil.: *De Schismate Donat.*, l. vii., c. iii. (Edit. Migne, p. 1087, t. xi., PP. LL.). "B. Petrus et præferri Apostolis omnibus meruit, et claves regni cœlorum communicandas cæteris solus accepit."

disciples; as for instance: 'To thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.'"[147] Thus the gift of the keys of the kingdom of heaven to Peter, implied his primacy and supremacy over the Church, by reason of which he represented the Church; and the keys given to him were to be communicated to the Church itself, of which he was head and leader. "The Church," says the holy doctor, "of which St. Peter, on account of the primacy of his Apostleship, bore the figure, received from Christ the keys of the kingdom of heaven."[148] But the keys, as the same Father asserts in another place, were given to Peter, and to Peter alone (*illi uni*).[149] The divine institution of the primacy in the Church was intended, as we have before said, to maintain unity. Hence St. Cyprian says: "First to Peter, upon whom He built the Church, and from whom He appointed and showed that unity should arise, the Lord gave this power—that what he should have loosed on earth

[147] S. Augustinus: In Ps. cviii, n. 1 (Op., t. iv.,pp. 910-11). "Sicut enim quædam dicuntur quæ ad Apostolum Petrum proprie pertinere videantur, nec tamen habent illustrem intellectum, nisi cum referuntur ad Ecclesiam, cujus ille agnoscitur in figura gestasse personam, propter primatum, quem in discipulis habuit: sicuti est, "Tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum."

[148] *Serm.* clxix., n. 4 (Mai Nova Biblioth. PP., t. i., p. 380). "Ecclesia cujus Petrus propter primatum Apostolatus, figuram gerebat, claves a Christo regni cœlorum accepit." St. Augustin frequently alleges that St. Peter represented the Church, on account of his supremacy, as a king represents his nation.—See l. ii. *De Baptismo contra Donatistas*, c. i., n. 2 (Op., t. ix. Edit. cit., p. 65). In that place he says: "Apostolum Petrum, in quo primatus Apostolorum tam excellenti gratia præeminet . . . Quis nescit illum Apostolatus principatum cuilibet episcopatui præferendum?" Moreover, in the *Serm.* lxxvi., c. ii., n. 3 (Op., t. v.. p. 291), he says: "Petrus a petra cognominatus beatus, Ecclesiæ figuram portans, *apostolatus principatum tenens.*"

[149] *Serm.* cxlix., c. vi., n. 7 (Op., t. v., p. 492).

that should be loosed in heaven."[150] All the old Catholic writers speak in the same manner. That this is true of the Greek Fathers, may be seen by reference to the passages quoted from Firmilian,[151] Origen,[152] St. Chrysostom,[153] St. Basil,[154] St. Gregory of Nyssa,[155] St. Gregory Nazianzen,[156] and many others, down to Photius himself, who could not but own that to Peter the keys were committed, and the guardianship of the gates of heaven.[157]

VIII. But, as already remarked, so long as Christ our Lord was upon earth, ruling His disciples as their sovereign head and divine master, He did not confer upon Peter the authority which He had promised him

[150] S. Cyprianus: *Epist.* lxxiii. *ad Jubaianum*, p. 131. Edit. Balut.

[151] Firmilianus: *Epist. ad S. Cyprianum* (inter Epist. S. Cypr. lxxv., p. 148). "Soli Petro Christus dixerat: 'Tibi dabo claves, &c.'"

[152] Origenes: Tom. xii., in Matt., n. 11 (Op., t. iii. Edit. De la Rue, p. 525-26), et t. xiii., n. 31, pp. 613-14. *ἰδίᾳ τοῦτο προτέταχται ἐπὶ τοῦ Πέτρου τό, Δώσω σοι τὰς κλεῖς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν . . . . οὐ γὰρ ὀλίγη διαφορά τὸν Πέτρον εἰληφέναι τὰς κλεῖδας οὐκ ἐνὸς οὐρανοῦ, ἀλλὰ πλειόνων.* This then, according to Origen, is the difference between St. Peter and the other Apostles.

[153] S. Chrysostomus: *Hom.* liv. al, lv., in Matt., n. 2 (Op., t. vii., pp. 547-48).

[154] S. Basilius: *In Proœmio de Judicio Dei*, n. 7 (Op., t. ii., p. 221.

[155] S. Greg. Nyss.: *De Castigatione* (Op., t. iii. Edit. Migne, p. 311). *Διὰ Πέτρου ἔδωκε τοῖς ἐπισκόποις τὴν κλεῖδα τῶν ἐπουρανίων τιμῶν.*

[156] S. Greg. Naz: *Carmin*, l. i., sec. ii., *Poem. Moral. in laudem Virginitatis*, vs. 488, 489 (Op., t. ii. Edit. Caillau, 1840, Parisiis, p. 324).

[157] Photius: *Epistolar*, l. i., epist. viii., n. 26 (Op., t. ii. Edit. Migne, p. 661). *Οὕτω Πέτρος ὁ κορυφαῖος τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν οὐρανίων πυλῶν τὰς κλεῖς ἐμπεπιστευμένος καὶ τὴν εἴσοδον . . . οὕτως ἡμῶν οἱ Πατέρες παρειλήφασιν, οὕτως ἡμῖν, τοῖς μετ' ἐκείνους, παραδεδώκασιν.*

as the rock and supreme ruler of the Church; but immediately before leaving this world and ascending into heaven, He actually committed to the Apostle's hands the government of His Church, that he might discharge in it the office of visible head. We read this in the Gospel of St. John, xxi. 15—17. Christ appointed Peter universal shepherd to feed His whole flock; but as the manifestation of a sublime faith had been required before his establishment as the immovable rock of the Church, so now an extraordinary charity, surpassing that of his fellow Apostles, was exacted, in order that he might be invested with the title of shepherd, which so specially belonged to his Master. This was, in truth, one of the most glorious titles under which the Divine Saviour had been prophetically announced in the Old Testament. "I raise one shepherd over them," said God, by the mouth of Ezechiel, "and he feeds them, even my servant David. He shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd."[158] "He shall feed his flock like a shepherd," is the prophecy of Isaias; "He shall gather together the lambs with his arm, and shall take them up in his bosom."[159] He is also presented under the same figure by others of the prophets, as Micheas and Osee.[160] And the Divine Redeemer chose that one title before all attributed to Him by the prophets, and was pleased to call Himself a shepherd —"I am the Good Shepherd."[161] He represented His disciples and followers as His sheep, who hear His voice,[162] promising to bring all His sheep into one fold, that there might be one fold and one shepherd;[163] lastly, as a good shepherd, He laid down His life for His sheep.[164] Now this favourite title He gives to Peter

[158] Ezech. xxxiv. 23. [159] Isaias xl. ii.
[160] Michæas v. 4. Osee iii. 5. [161] S. Joan. x. 11—14.
[162] S. Joan. x. 27. [163] S. Joan. x. 16. [164] S. Joan. x. 11.

to whose care He intends to commit His whole flock, placing it under his rule. "Feed My lambs, feed My sheep." That charge, thrice repeated by our Lord to Peter, regards Peter, and Peter alone, because it refers to him who was thrice asked: "Simon, son of Jona, lovest thou Me more than these?" Moreover, the power here conferred is no more limited than is the number of those over whom it is given; and "My lambs," "My sheep," comprise not only all the faithful, but even the Apostles themselves, as belonging to the flock of Christ: so that Christ entrusted His sheep to Peter without any exception or limitation whatsoever. Thus, by those words, our Lord invested Peter with authority over the whole body of the Apostles; that is to say, He appointed him œcumenical pastor. Such is the doctrine taught by the Fathers both of the East and of the West. St. Ephrem speaks of the flock committed to St. Peter's care, as spread over the whole world, and of St. Peter being their pastor and their head.[165] "To him," writes St. Epiphanius, "was committed the flock: he leads the way admirably in the power of his own master."[166] St. Chrysostom, commenting on these words of St. John, speaks yet more forcibly. "Why," he says, "passing by the rest, does He discourse with Peter concerning these things? He was the chosen one of the Apostles, and the mouth of the disciples, and the head of the company. For this cause, also, did St. Paul take his journey and visit him before the rest. And, withal, showing him that henceforth he must have confidence, for his denial has been done away with, Christ places in his hands the empire

[165] Penes Assemani: *Bibl. Orient.*, t. i., p. 95.

[166] S. Epiphanius: *In Anchorato*, n. 9 (Op., t. ii. Edit. Pet., p. 15). Ὁ πεπιστευμένος τὴν ποίμνην ὁ καλῶς ὁδηγῶν ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τῆ ἰδίᾳ δεσπότου.

over the brethren."[167] Hence the saint concludes: "Should anyone say, 'Why then did James receive the episcopate of Jerusalem?' this is my answer: that He appointed Peter, teacher not of that church, but of the habitable globe."[168] St. Asterius is still more explicit on this point. "When our Saviour," he says, "was about to sanctify the human race by a voluntary death, *he commits the Universal and Œcumenical Church as a special trust* to Peter, after having thrice asked him, 'Lovest thou me?' But as he readily replied to these three questions by as many confessions, he received the world in charge, as it were one fold under one shepherd; having heard 'Feed My lambs,' &c."[169] We shall mention, later on, the letter of the Eastern bishops to Pope Symmachus, as well as the *Libellus Precum* presented by the Bishop of Dora to Pope Martin I., both of which express the like view. It would be useless to bring a catena of Fathers of the Latin Church in support of this doctrine. Some we have already quoted. We promised to be brief in this matter; and so we shall be content with adding the words of St. Ambrose only. "The Lord," he says, "does not doubt: He puts a question, not in order to learn, but to teach him, now that He is about to be raised to heaven, whom He would leave unto us as the vicar of His own love. . . . And therefore,

[167] *Hom.* lxxxviii., in Joan., n. 1 (Op., t. viii, p. 525). ἐγχειρίζεται τὴν προστασίαν τῶν ἀδελφῶν . . . . . προϊστασο τῶν ἀδελφῶν. It is surprising to find Mr. Palmer quoting the second part of this passage of St. Chrysostom in order to show that we cannot rely on the words of St. John with regard to St. Peter's supremacy. It is lost labour to read the Fathers merely in the light of preconceived opinion.

[168] *Ibid.* n. 1, p. 527.

[169] S. Asterius: *Hom.* viii., *in SS. Petrum et Paulum.* Edit. Migne, cit., p. 281.

because he alone of all makes this profession, he is preferred before all, for his love is greater than that of all. . . . And now he is ordered to feed His lambs; not only His younger sheep, as in the second instance, but also His sheep, that the more perfect may govern the more perfect."[170]

IX. From what we have briefly stated in the two preceding sections, it appears evident that "there is something in the Apostolic system which gives an authority to the Pope over the Church." And the patrons of *Tract XC.* would have found it, had they studied that system with more care and freedom from prejudice. Doubtless, all the Apostles were entrusted with the power of binding and loosing; but Peter, and Peter alone, received the keys of the kingdom of heaven. All were to concur in laying the foundation of the Church of Christ; but Peter, and Peter alone, was to be its rock. All the faithful were to be founded upon the Apostles; but the Apostles themselves, together with all their several flocks, were to be grounded on the great rock, Peter. All the Apostles were sent to feed all nations with the doctrine of Christ; but Peter alone was to be the supreme and œcumenical pastor over the whole world. All nations were the sheep of the Apostles; but all nations, together with their pastors, were to be the sheep of Peter, since all the sheep of Christ, without exception, were committed to him. Such truly is the doctrine expressed by the Fathers on the inequality of the Apostles with reference to St. Peter's supremacy. "To Peter," remarks St. Cyprian, "He says, after His resurrection, 'Feed My sheep.' Upon him, being one, He builds His Church, and though He gives to all the Apostles an equal power, and says, 'As My Father sent

[170] S. Ambrosius: *Comm.* in Lucam, l. x., n. 175-76 (Op., t. i. Edit. cit., p. 1542).

Me, &c.,' yet, in order to manifest unity, He has by His supreme authority so placed the source of the same unity as to begin from one."[171] Origen,[172] St. Basil,[173] St. Gregory Nazianzen,[174] St. Optatus of Milevis,[175] St. Ambrose,[176] St. Jerome,[177] St. Augustin,[178] St. Leo,[179] St. Asterius,[180] and other Fathers bear witness, precisely and definitely, to the same doctrine. Indeed, there is no Father who has ventured to ascribe either to individual Apostles, or to the Apostolic College, the titles assigned by Christ to Peter; but on him, in order to show his real pre-eminence and authority over his fellow Apostles, they lavish the most singular expressions of praise.[181] Moreover, regarding St. Peter as the head of the Apostolic College, they represent the power of the Apostles to be derived from him, and to

[171] S. Cyprianus: *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, p. 195. In many MSS. and editions, after the quoted words we find—"Et primatus Petro datur, ut una Christi Ecclesia et cathedra una monstretur."

[172] Origenes: In Matt., t. xiii., n. 31 (Op., t. iii., p. 613).

[173] S. Basilius: *Serm.* vii., n. 5 (Op., t. iii., p. 508, et in *Præf. de Judicio*, n. vii. (Op., t. ii., p. 221).

[174] S. Greg. Naz.: *Orat.* xxxii., n. 18 (Op., t. i. Edit. cit., p. 591).

[175] S. Optatus Mil.: *De Sch. Don.*, l. ii., c. ii., p. 947. Edit. Migne.

[176] S. Ambrosius: *Comm.* in S. Lucam, l. x., pp. 175-6 et 1542 (Op., t. i.).

[177] S. Hieron.: *Adv. Jovin.*, l. i., n. 26 (Op., t. ii. Edit. Vallarsii, p. 279).

[178] S. Aug.: *Serm.* xlvi., c. xiii., n. 30 (Op., t. v., pp. 168-69).

[179] S. Leo: *Serm.* iv., c. ii. (Op., t. i. Edit. Ball., p. 16); *Epist.* xiv., c. xi., p. 691, seq.

[180] St. Astérius: *Serm.* viii., cit. Edit. Migne, p. 268, seq.

[181] The Greek Fathers called St. Peter τὸν πρῶτον, τὸν μέγιστον, τὸν μέγαν κατ' ἐξοχήν; τὸν πρόκριτον, τὸν Θαυμάσιον, τὸν πανένδοξον, πανάγιον; ἀρχηγὸν τῶν αὐτοῦ μαθητῶν, προτάρχον τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποστόλων, κορυφαιότατον καὶ προστάτην τῶν ἀποστόλων. The Latin Fathers have the like expressions. See Father Schrader, S.J., *De Unitate Ecclesiæ Romanæ*, l. i., c. iv., n. viii., pp. 166—68, in notis. Edit. Friburgi, 1862.

flow from the head into the whole body.[182] Thus antiquity has ever expressed its deep and immovable conviction that the Apostolic Church was not founded on the principle of the equality of the Apostles, but on the basis of the supremacy of St. Peter. The Catholic writers of antiquity always regard the supremacy of St. Peter as a supremacy of Jurisdiction, between which and a supremacy of Order a broad distinction is constantly drawn. All the Apostles were equally bishops, in virtue of the ordination received from Christ; they were also equally endowed with the power of the Apostolate, in virtue of the mission entrusted to them by Him. Peter, therefore, in respect of Order, had the same Apostolic commission with the others, since, no less than the rest of the twelve, he was a bishop and an Apostle; but he was superior to all, in respect of Jurisdiction whereby he was independent of all, while on him all were dependent; so that they were unable to exercise the office of their mission unless in connection with, and in subordination, to him. Nevertheless, the Apostles had received from Christ such extraordinary privileges and universal power, that the Apostolic age constituted in a manner an exceptional state in the government of the Church, and one not destined to last beyond their lifetime, while the powers conferred on them for the government of the Church—episcopacy and supremacy—were intended to be permanent. The first of these was to represent the source and the perfection of Order; the second the fountain-head of Jurisdiction. St. Peter and his successors were not to be superior to other bishops as

[182] S. Optatus Mil.: l. vii., *De Sch. Don.*, c. iii., pp. 1081—88; S. Leo, *Epist.* x., *ad Episc. Vien.*, n. i. (Op., vol. i. Edit. Ball., p. 633); *Epist.* v., Siricii papæ, n. i. (Coustant., p. 651); *Epist.* ii., Innocentii I., n. ii. (Coustant., p. 747), et *Epist.* xxx., n. ii. (Coustant. p. 899); *Epist.* v., Xysti III., n. iii., p. 1255, &c.

regards the episcopal character, which in virtue of sacramental ordination they received from God, but by virtue of their supreme jurisdiction, whereby the rest were to be kept in subordination and unity. Thus did the Apostolic government prefigure and foreshow the system of government instituted by Christ for His Church. But the ordinary and regular government must be distinguished from that which is extraordinary and exceptional. The Apostleship, indeed, conferred on the Apostles extraordinary and exceptional powers in connection with their universal mission, in union with Peter and in subordination to him: but the Apostleship had only one definite task to perform, that of laying the foundations of the Church. Those once laid, the Apostleship gave way to the ordinary and regular government, and the bishops who succeeded the Apostles saw the sphere of the exercise of their power limited by the boundaries of their dioceses;[183] as was, in fact, the case even with the Apostles after the division of provinces.[184] No bishop but one ever

[183] That the bishops who succeeded the Apostles were bound to confine the exercise of their power within a limited field, appears not only from the absence of any proof to the contrary, but also from the positive evidence of passages both of the Scripture and of the Fathers. In the Second Epistle to the Corinthians i. 1., Timothy is called, "Our Brother unto the Church of God, which is at Corinth." Moreover, the bishops never pretended to act authoritatively in any other diocese but their own. Thus we may quote St. Ignatius the martyr, *Epist. ad Ephes.*, capp. iii., iv. (Edit. Jacobson, pp. 270—72); ad Magn. cap. ii., iii. (p. 308—12); ad Trull., capp. i., iii. (pp. 334—36), &c. St. Dionysius of Corinth writes to other churches, only because he was asked by their bishops (Euseb., l. iv., c. xxiii. Edit. Valesii, p. 145).

[184] After the division of the provinces in which the Apostles were to preach the Gospel, they did not exercise their Apostolical power in a province different from their own unless exceptionally, as in a case of heresy.—See Schelestrate: *Antiquitas Ecclesiæ*, t. ii., dis. ii., c. ii., p. 85, seq. Edit. Romæ, 1697.

claimed universal power in the Church, as having succeeded to the Apostles; but the Bishop of Rome, as successor of St. Peter in the supreme rule, maintained and enforced his power in the Universal Church. He has never ceased to proclaim himself the centre and the visible head of the Church, holding the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and entrusted with the care of the whole flock of Christ; while the bishops throughout the Church, primates and patriarchs, successors of Apostles in Apostolic sees, did not oppose his power; nay, they submitted to it. Is this not an evident demonstration of the divine institution of the primacy of St. Peter and his successors?

SECTION III.

THE PAPAL SUPREMACY PROCLAIMED BY PREDECESSORS OF GREGORY I., AND BY THAT GREAT POPE HIMSELF.

I. DR. PUSEY, in the usual tone of Protestant sectarians, complains of the excessive extension of the Pontifical power, and of the practical system of Rome, which, with great simplicity, he attributes to the false decretals.[185] He, therefore, pretends to believe that the supremacy established by Christ, and exercised by the Roman Pontiffs over the Universal Church, is one of the great corruptions of the Roman communion. For this reason, he and his whole party, like other Protestant writers from the beginning of the Reformation down to our own time, agree in appealing to the *Achilles* of their arguments—namely, that St. Gregory refused to assume the title of œcumenical pastor, after having condemned the assumption of it by the Patriarch of Constantinople.[186] In the opinion of Dr. Pusey and his followers, this fact presents an insurmountable obstacle to any justification of the progress and growth of Papal authority, for, as they conceive, it shows that St. Gregory, with his predecessors and his successors, till the age of the forged decretals, disclaimed any supreme authority over the Universal Church; since, unless the predecessors of St. Gregory had, at least, practically disclaimed such supreme authority in the Church, the expressions used by that Pope would be of no avail to prove that a doctrinal change on this

[185] *Eirenicon*, p. 237, seq. [186] *Ibid*, Postscriptum, pp. 309—14.

point was forced upon the Church by the Pseudo-Isidorian forgery. It is strange that hereditary opinions can so far distort the testimony of antiquity in the eyes of Protestants, who so constantly and so boldly appeal to its decision. An ordinary acquaintance with the authentic letters of the early Popes might at least have taught them that these venerable pontiffs conceived themselves to be *jure divino* heads of the Church. But, in truth, the study of antiquity is often neglected, even by those who are foremost in ascribing to it doctrines which it utterly repudiates.

II. Let us examine the original letters,[187] by which the Popes exerted their prerogative of governing the whole Church, from the commencement of the series at the close of the fourth century. What are the views expressed in them? what authority do they claim? Upon what ground do the Popes rest their power and their prerogative? First, Pope Siricius (385—398) shall answer, speaking as follows to the Bishop of Tarragona: "We bear the burdens of all who labour, or rather the blessed Apostle Peter bears them in us, he who in all things, as we trust, protects and defends us, the heirs of his administration."[188] And he declares that he had been entrusted with *the care of all the churches*,[189] of which the Roman Church was the head.[190] Innocent I. (402—417) expresses the same conviction when he says, that applications had been made to him as to the head and apex of the episcopate;[191] and he asserts that the episcopate itself, and all the authority of the Roman

[187] The letters of the Popes for the first three centuries are lost; their regular series commences with Pope Siricius.

[188] S. Siricius: *Epist.* i., n. 1 (Coustant., p. 624).

[189] *Ibid.*, *Epist.* vi., n. 1 (Coustant., p. 659).

[190] *Epist.* i., cit., n. 20 (Coustant., p. 637).

[191] S. Innocentius I.: *Epist.* xxxvii., n. 1 (Coustant., p. 910). "Ad nos quasi ad caput atque ad apicem episcopatus referre."

See, owes its origin to the Apostle Peter.[192] Pope Zosimus (417—418) writes still more clearly on the authority of the Apostolic See. He declares that such was its authority, that no one might venture to question its judgment; that St. Peter himself was the fountain-head of this authority, which, therefore, descended from him and rested on the divine promises made to him.[193] In like manner, Boniface I. (418—422) inculcates this truth throughout his fifteenth letter, wherein he solemnly declares that the care of the Universal Church was entrusted to St. Peter, who was its rock; and that hence the authority of the Roman See embraced both East and West:[194] for which reason he calls it the head of all the churches spread over all the whole world.[195] Celestine (422—432) makes use of similar language to express the same doctrine as to his Pontifical authority, which, as he says, extends its care wherever the name of God is preached.[196] And, accordingly, he wrote in

[192] S. Innocentius I.: *Epist.* xxix., n. 1 (Coustant., p. 888). "Sequi desideramus Apostolum . . . a quo ipse episcopatus et tota auctoritas hujus nominis emersit."

[193] S. Zosimus: *Epist.* xii., n. 1 (Coustant., p. 974). "Traditio Patrum Apostolicæ sedi auctoritatem tantam tribuerit, ut de ejus judicio disceptare nullus auderet . . . a quo (Petro) ipsa quoque descendit . . . ex ipsa quoque Christi Domini nostri promissione ut et ligata solveret . . . cum tantæ auctoritatis Petrus caput sit, &c."

[194] S. Bonifacius I.: *Epist.* xv., n. 1 (Coustant., p. 1039). "Manet B. Petrum Apostolum per sententiam dominicam universalis ecclesiæ ab hoc sollicitudo suscepta; quippe quam, Evangelio teste, in se noverit esse fundatam: nec unquam ejus honor vacuus potest esse curarum, cum certum sit summam rerum ex ejus deliberatione pendere."

[195] S. Bonifacius I.: *Epist.* xiv., n. 1., p. 1037. "Hanc (Ecclesiam Romanam) ergo Ecclesiis toto orbe diffusis velut caput suorum certum est esse membrorum."

[196] S. Cœlestinus: *Epist.* iv., n. 1 (Coustant., p. 1066). "Circa quamvis longinqua spiritalis cura non deficit, sed se per omnia, qua nomen Dei prædicatur, extendit."

this sense to the people of Constantinople, when they were rent asunder by the perverse doctrines of Nestorius. He reminds them that "His daily pressure of toil was the care of all the churches; so that, having learnt that his members were being rent asunder by perverse doctrines, he was inflamed with paternal solicitude for them, feeling the heat of the fire which was burning them, . . . since they were his bowels."[197] Sixtus III. (432—440), his successor, bears witness to the same doctrine, saying that "The blessed Apostle Peter had transferred to his successors what he had received." Whence he concludes: "Who then would separate from the doctrine of him, whom the Master Himself declared to be the first among the Apostles?"[198] But the works of Pope Leo the Great (440—461) are, throughout, full of the great idea of the dignity conferred on the See of Rome, and of its universal divine authority over the whole world.[199] This great Pontiff carefully laid down the distinction between the hierarchy of Order and that of Jurisdiction. He shows the Apostolic See to be that centre whereon the care of the universal Church rests, and with which nothing should be at variance.[200] He

[197] S. Cœlestinus: *Epist.* xiv., n. 1 (Coustant., p. 1131).

[198] S. Xystus III.: *Epist.* vi., n. 5 (Coustant., p. 1260).

[199] S. Leo I.: *Epist.* v., c. ii. Edit. Ballerini (Op., t. i., p. 617). "Per omnes Ecclesias cura nostra distenditur, exigente hoc a nobis Domino, qui Apostolicæ dignitatis B. Apostolo Petro primatum, fidei suæ remuneratione, commisit, universalem Ecclesiam in fundamenti ipsius soliditate constituens."

[200] S. Leo I.: *Epist.* xiv., *ad Anast. Episc. Thess.*, c. xi. (Op., t. i. Edit. Ball., p. 691, seq.). "Hæc connexio totius quidem corporis (Ecclesiæ) unanimitatem requirit, sed præcipue exigit concordiam sacerdotum, quibus cum dignitas sit communis (the power of Order), non est tamen ordo generalis (the power of Jurisdiction), quoniam et inter Beatissimos Apostolos in similitudine honoris fuit quædam discretio potestatis, et cum omnium par esset electio, uni tamen datum est ut cæteris præemineret. De qua forma quoque Episcoporum est orta distinctio, et magna ordinatione

wrote to the metropolitans of Illyricum: "Whereas our care extends to all the churches, this being required of us by the Lord, who committed the primacy of the Apostolic dignity to the most blessed Apostle Peter, in reward of his faith, establishing the Universal Church on the solidity of him the foundation, we are associated in that necessary solicitude which we feel for those who are joined with us in the charity of (episcopal) fellowship."[201] Were we in need of further testimonies, the letters of St. Leo would furnish us with many more quotations. Nor do the successors of St. Leo fail to employ similar language. It is useless to multiply extracts from their letters, when each and all agree in solemnly maintaining the fundamental idea that *the flock of Christ spread over the whole world—the Universal Church—was committed by Christ to the paternal care of St. Peter and his successors.* We can refer to St. Simplicius (468—483);[202] St. Felix III. (483—492);[203] St.

provisum est, ne omnes sibi omnia vindicarent, sed essent in singulis provinciis singuli quorum inter fratres haberetur prima sententia: et rursus quidam in majoribus urbibus constituti sollicitudinem susciperent ampliorem, *per quos ad unam Petri sedem universalis Ecclesiæ cura confluereț, et nihil usquam a suo capite dissideret.*" In *Serm.* iv., c. ii. (Op., t. i., p. 16), he says, "Quamvis in populo Dei multi sint sacerdotes, multique pastores; omnes tamen proprie regat Petrus, quos principaliter regit et Christus."

[201] S. Leo I.: *Epist.* v., *ad Episcop. Metrop. per Illyricum constitutos*, c. ii., p. 617.

[202] S. Simplicius: *Epist.* iv., *ad Zenonem Imp.* (Labbe, t. v., p. 98). "Perstat in successoribus suis (Petri) hæc et eadem Apostolicæ norma doctrinæ, cui Dominus totius curam ovilis injunxit." See also *Epist.* x., *ad Zenonem Imp.* (Labbe, l. c., p. 116).

[203] S. Felix II.: *Epist.* i., *ad Zenonem Imp.* (Labbe, l. c., p. 143-44). "Postquam . . . ministerii, quod regebat (Simplicius) ad meæ humilitatis officium gubernacula pervenerunt, in diversas generalis Ecclesiæ curas, quas ubique terrarum cunctis populis christianis summi Pastoris voce delegante, B. Petrus Apostolus pervigili moderatione dispensat; continuo me sollicitudo

Gelasius (492—496);[204] St. Anastasius II. (496—498);[205] St. Symmachus (498—514);[206] St. Hormisdas (514—523;[207] and many others who, in unbroken succession, defend the dignity and the authority of the Apostolic See: and, as we hope to show in the next section, their acts were in accordance with their words.

III. Now, after reading this series of the testimonies of Pontiffs, predecessors of St. Gregory I., it seems strange to hear from the High Church writers, and from Protestants of every shade, that before the seventh century the Popes had no thought of claiming supreme authority in the Universal Church. It is childish to think that the objection made by St. Gregory the Great to the use of the title "œcumenical bishop," is an unanswerable refutation of the divine supremacy of the Pope in the Universal Church, when we know that a long line of preceding Pontiffs had publicly and explicitly proclaimed the opposite doctrine. But did

maxima . . . urgebat tam Alexandrinæ urbis quam status totius orientalis regionis excepit."

[204] S. Gelasius: *Epist.* v., *ad Hom. Dalmat. Episc.* (Labbe, t. v., p. 298). "Pro sedes Apostolicæ moderamine totius ovilis Dominici curam sine cessatione tractantes, quam B. Petro Salvatoris ipsius nostri voce delegata est." And in *Epist.* xii., *ad Æonium Arel. Episc.* (Labbe, l. c., p. 324). "Quanto totius ovilis curam Christo Domino delegante, susceptam B. Petri Apostoli gubernatio principalis universo gregi debet in orbe terrarum, tanto pietatis affectu, cunctas Ecclesias, earumque rectores amplectitur, &c." See also *Epist.* viii., *ad Anast. Imp.* (Labbe, l. c., pp. 308—311).

[205] S. Anastasius: *Epist.* i., *ad Anast. Imp.* (Labbe, t. v., p. 406). "Sedes B. Petri *in universali Ecclesia assignatum sibi a Domino Deo tenet principatum.*"

[206] S. Symmachus: *Epist.* viii., *ad Orientales* (Labbe, t. v., p. 433). Its words in the next section.

[207] All the letters of Pope Hormisdas are evidently written under the conviction of the supreme authority of the Roman See over the whole Church. See *Epist.* vii., xi.—xiv. (Labbe, t. v., pp. 574, 586, 588—590).

St. Gregory the Great in any wise contradict the teaching of his predecessors? We deny it; and unequivocally maintain that this great Pope ever spoke in harmony with all the other successors of St. Peter, both when stating the character of the Papal authority, and when condemning the term of "universal bishop." Unquestionably, St. Gregory uniformly held the same view as to the authority of the Apostolic See over the Universal Church. In fact, he called that see "*Head of all the Churches*[208]*—Head of the Faith*," so that other churches, according to his view, formed its body and were its members; but the health of the body, and all its members, depended upon the soundness of the head.[209] For this reason he frequently and repeatedly inculcated in his letters that his Pontifical cares extended over the Universal Church, since he occupied the Apostolic See which is raised above all the churches;[210] that hence no bishop, when rebuked or corrected by the Supreme Head of the Church, could refuse subjection to him.[211] Moreover, he intimated that the universal authority of the Pope is derived from the prerogatives divinely conferred on St. Peter;[212]

[208] S. Gregorius I.: *Epist.*, l. xiii., epist. xlv., capit. ii. (Op., t. ii. Edit. Maur, Parisiis, p. 1254). "Apostolica sedes omnium Ecclesiarum caput est."

[209] S. Gregorius I.: *Epist.*, l. xiii., epist. lvii. (l. c., p. 1244).

[210] S. Gregorius I.: *Epist.*, l. iii., epist. xxx. (l. c., p. 645); *Epist.*, l. v., epist. xiii. (l. c., p. 737); *Epist.*, l. vii., epist. xix. (l. c., p. 865), &c. "Cunctarum Ecclesiarum injuncta sollicitudinis cura constringet."

[211] S. Gregorius I.: *Epist.*, l. ix., epist. lix. (l. c., p. 976). "Si qua culpa in episcopis invenitur, nescio quis ei (Apostolicæ Sedi) episcopus subjectus non sit."

[212] S. Gregorius I.: *Epist.*, l. v., epist. xx., *ad Maurit. Imp.* (l. c., p. 748). "Cunctis Evangelium scientibus liquet quod voce Dominica sancto et omnium Apostolorum Petro Principi Apostolo *totius Ecclesiæ cura commissa est.* Ipsi enim dicitur, &c. (Joan.

so that in some places he speaks of the Apostolic See under the name of St. Peter.[213] And when Eulogius, the Patriarch of Alexandria, declared his conviction that "Peter was still living in his successors in the Roman See," St. Gregory replied that he had been extremely delighted with this expression of the Egyptian Patriarch concerning the Chair of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, to the effect that he still continued to sit therein in the person of his successors.[214] Thus does St. Gregory speak of the authority of the Apostolic See. His claims are seen to be neither wider nor more restricted than those of every one of his predecessors and of his successors down to the present day.

IV. After having perused the foregoing testimonies, taken from the works of St. Gregory, the reader may be at a loss to account for the stress laid by Dr. Pusey upon certain passages of that Pope's writings quoted by him in his *Eirenicon.* He informs us that St. Gregory used the following expression: "Christ Himself (the Mediator between God and man) is that rock from which Peter received his name, and upon which He said that He would build His Church." And in another place: "It is now said to the Universal Church, 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth,' &c."[215] He adds that St. Gregory spoke as follows in one of his

xxi. 17, Matt. xvi. 18, Lucæ xxii. 31.) . . . Ecce claves regni cœlestis accepit, potestas ei ligandi et solvendi tribuitur, *cura ei totius Ecclesiæ et principatus committitur.*"

[213] S. Gregorius I.: *Epist.*, l. vi., epist. liv., lv. (l. c., pp. 831, 832).

[214] S. Gregorius I.: *Epist.*, l. vii., epist. xl. (l. c., p. 887, seq.). "Suavissime mihi sanctitas vestra multa in Epistolis suis de S. Petri Apostolorum Principis cathedra loquuta est, dicens, *quod ipsa in ea nunc usque in suis successoribus sedeat.*"

[215] *Eirenicon*: Postscriptum, p. 309.

letters to the Patriarch Eulogius: "And thus, though the Apostles be many, yet the see of the Chief of the Apostles, which belongs to one, though it is in three places, alone prevailed in authority, by virtue of the headship of that one. For it is he who exalted the see in which he also condescended to take his rest, and finish the present life. It is he who adorned the see, to which he sent the Evangelist, his disciple. It is he who established the see, in which he sat for seven years, though he was to leave it. Inasmuch, then, as the see, over which by divine authority three bishops now preside, is one man's, and one, whatever good I hear of you I lay to mine own account."[216] Now by all these extracts Dr. Pusey intends to prove that when St. Gregory maintained that the only head of the Church is Christ our Lord, and that the sees of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, are equal in authority, he shows himself to hold doctrines unfavourable to the claims set forth on behalf of Papal supremacy as a divine institution. But the author seems not to understand St. Gregory's doctrine aright. For the holy Father's teaching on the point is that of all antiquity, the doctrine of the Catholic world, the teaching of the whole line of Pontiffs down to the present day. Christ is, indeed, the principal and invisible head of the Church; He is the primary foundation of it, whereon Peter was set to be a secondary foundation, from Whom the Apostle received his name, his strength, and his stability. We have already set forth this doctrine according to the mind of the Fathers, and we have shown that Peter's divine supremacy not only does not exclude this principle, but rather implies it as a necessary complement. What wonder then if, in the words of St. Gregory,

[216] *Eirenicon*, Postscriptum, pp. 308, 309.

"St. Paul rejects the idea of members of the Lord's body being subjected to certain heads, as it were, beside Christ (*extra Christum*), and that even to the Apostles themselves, as leaders of parties (*ipsis Apostolis subjici partialiter evitavit*)," &c.[217] St. Gregory, indeed, with the rest of the Fathers, following in the footsteps of the Apostles, represents the Church as the mystical body of Christ, of which He is the head. In this point of view the faithful cannot be under other heads who are not in unity with Christ, who are separated from Him as independent parts detached from the whole (*partialiter*); they are to be under Christ, the supreme head, and to be joined to Him as His members, but they cannot be members of Christ if they be subject to such as are in no connection with Christ, to such as set themselves up as principal head, each independent of any other. For Christ is found in unity, not in division. Is Christ divided? His mystical body is one, and none can be under Him, as divine head, unless he be a member of His body. Therefore, St. Gregory, regarding the Apostles and Peter himself from that point of view, declares them to be all members of the Holy Universal Church, all members under one head. Surely all the Apostles, and Peter their chief, in comparison with Christ, were but His members; not one of them is the head, all are built upon Him—He is the foundation. This doctrine of St. Gregory is no other than that of the Fathers, and of the whole Catholic Church. But is it inconsistent

[217] S. Gregorius: *Epist.*, l. v., epist. xviii. (t. ii., p. 743); and Dr. Pusey, l. c., p. 313. We do not approve of the version adopted by Dr. Pusey and others, of the words of St. Gregory, "extra Christum" (*besides* Christ). St. Paul, speaking of members of the mystical body of Christ, meant nothing by "extra Christum," but "out of Christ;" that is to say, detached from the union of the mystical body.

with the doctrine of St. Peter's supremacy in the Church? In St. Gregory's opinion it was not.

V. It is undeniable that in this same series of letters he asserts, and in the most explicit terms, the doctrine of St. Peter's supremacy. To call this in question would betray a complete ignorance of what the illustrious Pontiff again and again repeats concerning the prerogatives of St. Peter and his see of Rome. The extracts given above suffice to prove beyond all possibility of cavil that on this point his faith was identical with that of all Catholics. We now invite attention to St. Gregory's epistle to the Emperor Maurice, some passages of which we quoted in the earlier part of this section. "All who know the Gospel," he says, in this epistle, "are aware that, by the divine word, St. Peter, the Prince of all the Apostles, was entrusted with the care of the whole Church; because to him were addressed the words we read in St. John xxi. 17, St. Matt. xvi. 18, St. Luke xxii. 31," &c.[218] Therefore, according to St. Gregory's principles, St. Peter was appointed head over the whole Church, in order to rule it in virtue of authority received from Christ. And the Pontiff, after having quoted the passage from St. Matthew, proceeds in the same place: "Peter received the keys of the kingdom of heaven; on him is conferred the power of binding and loosing; to him is committed the care and the Princedom of the whole Church." He inculcates the same doctrine in another of his letters, when he says: "Peter certainly received power over the heavenly kingdom, so that whatever he binds or looses on earth is bound or loosed in heaven."[219] Again, Peter is directly and explicitly affirmed to be the foundation of the Church. "Who

[218] See No. 212 of this section.

[219] *Epist.*, l. xi., epist. xlv. (l. c., p. 1129).

does not know," he says, "that the Holy Church is founded on the solidity of the Prince of the Apostles?"[220] All must perceive by these extracts from St. Gregory's letters that his teaching on this point is the very same as that of the whole Catholic Church in all times. His doctrine can be summed up in these few propositions: Christ is the principal head, and the primary foundation on which the Church was built; Peter, therefore, with respect to Christ, is the secondary head and the secondary foundation; but with respect to the Church, he is its head and its foundation, himself being founded on the solidity of the corner-stone, Christ our Lord. Again, St. Gregory repeatedly asserts that Peter received from Christ the keys of the kingdom of heaven; but he does not, nor can he, deny, that the power of the keys was committed by Christ to the whole Church in union with Peter as its head. Because, first, although to Peter in an especial manner, as to the supreme ruler of the Church, Christ addressed the words recorded in St. Matthew xvi. 19, yet on another occasion the words, "Whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven," &c. (Matt. xviii. 18), were spoken by Him to the Universal Church united to its head, and represented by the whole Apostolic College. Secondly, even when Christ gave to Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven, he conferred that power on him as the head and supreme ruler of the Church. When the head of the Church received that power, the Church received it in and through him. Therefore the Fathers, and especially St. Augustine, say: "The Church received in Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven."[221] On this account, St. Gregory

[220] *Epist.*, l. vii., epist. xl. (l. c., p. 888).

[221] S. Augustinus: *Tract.* cxxiv., in Joan., n. 5 (Op., t. iii., p. 599. Edit. Antwerp.).

could safely assert: "It is now said to the Universal Church, 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth,'" &c. St. Augustine adds, by way of explanation, "That St. Peter then represented the whole Church in virtue of the character he bore."[222] But if we inquire what was that character, the same doctor answers that it was his supremacy; a remark which he repeats over and over again throughout his works.[223]

VI. As regards the words of St. Gregory's letter to the Patriarch Eulogius, concerning the three sees of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, it is evident that that passage has been entirely misunderstood. For how else could such a stress have been laid on it as tending to show that St. Gregory was at variance with the teaching of the Holy Catholic Church concerning the Papal supremacy? In that passage St. Gregory declares and explains the origin, the authority, and the final scope of the institution of the patriarchal sees. It cannot be denied that no other churches were in early times denominated patriarchal but those which had been established by the Prince of the Apostles, or by his care and authority. Hence, three only were regarded as patriarchal churches—namely, those of Rome, of Alexandria, and of Antioch. It is for this reason that the Council of Nice alludes to them in its sixth canon. Later, the Church of Constantinople was by a special privilege raised to this rank in the Second Œcumenical Council, as was that of Jerusalem at the Council of Chalcedon. But even after this addition, the first three were still considered as properly patriarchal churches, from the fact of their having been instituted by St. Peter. Moreover, these three churches, in virtue of

[222] S. Augustinus: l. c.

[223] S. Augustinus: *Serm.* lxxvi., n. 3 (Op., t. v., p. 596), *De Baptismo contra Donat.;* l. ii., n. 1 (Op., t. ix., p. 181-2); In Ps. cviii., n. 1 (Op., t. iv., p. 1733), &c.

their origin and privileges, had authority and jurisdiction over certain other churches, which regarded the patriarchal see as their immediate source (ἀρχή) from which they derived their origin, and as their centre, with which they were connected, and through which they were kept in unity. And certainly the communion of all the churches with Rome through the union of the patriarchal sees with the See of Peter was the essential and immediate effect of the institution of the patriarchates. St. Gregory, in the letter quoted above, most distinctly points out that end. He moreover expresses the same view in another letter to the same Patriarch Eulogius;[224] and in a third epistle, addressed to the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, he compares the three patriarchates with the leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal until the whole was leavened (St. Matt. xiii. 33).[225] But notwithstanding this, St. Gregory knew very well that although each of the Patriarchal sees was the ἀρχή of the inferior churches comprehended within the limits of its jurisdiction, yet, as regards the Church Universal, Rome only—the Apostolic See, not the united patriarchal churches—was the ἀρχή of all other churches, to which all other patriarchs were subject. Hence, as has been said, he called the Roman See head of all the churches, head of the faith, divinely raised above all the churches, and

[224] S. Greg.: *Epist.*, l. vi., epist. lx. (l. c., p. 836). "Longe a nobis non sumus qui unum sumus. Hanc autem esse nobis cum cæteris fratribus communem semper optamus. Est autem aliquid quod nos erga Alexandrinam Ecclesiam quadam peculiaritate constringit et in ejus amore proniores existere speciali quodammodo lege compellit. Nam sicut omnibus liquet, quod B. Evangelista Marcus a S. Petro Apostolo Magistro suo Alexandriam sit transmissus, sic hujus nos magistri et discipuli unitate constringimur, ut et ego sedi discipuli præsidere videar propter magistrum, et vos sedi magistri propter discipulum."

[225] S. Greg.: *Epist.*, l. v., epist. xliii. (l. c., p. 772).

entrusted with the care of all, to which every bishop is subject, and by which he must be corrected when found in fault. He therefore maintains that to go to the Roman Pontiff was the same as to go to St. Peter;[226] and he declares that for any of the four patriarchs it would be a grievous scandal to resist the decrees of the Roman Pontiff.[227] Such was the real teaching of that great Pope, who is so much venerated both in the Western and in the Eastern churches: from which it is apparent that St. Gregory's doctrine on the patriarchal sees, far from disparaging the supreme authority of the Papacy, affords it a new light and support.

VII. We will now briefly clear up another difficulty on which some Protestant writers insist with confidence. This is based on the great controversy between St. Gregory and the Patriarch of Constantinople on account of the title of œcumenical bishop. The point which we undertake to explain presents a double aspect; one concerns St. Gregory's having strongly protested against the Patriarch of Constantinople for his having assumed the title of "universal bishop;" the other regards his having declined to accept it himself. Now the title of "universal bishop" has a twofold meaning. The first implies that there is but one bishop in the whole Church, in whose person the universal episcopate is comprised, and, as it were, concentrated. The other asserts a supreme power over every bishop in the Universal Church. Unquestionably, in neither of those senses did the term justly belong to the Bishop of Constantinople, and if assumed by him in either of these senses it well deserved to be reprobated in the strong terms employed by St. Gregory and so carefully repeated by Protestants when speaking of this matter.[228] In truth, for some

[226] S. Greg.: *Epist.*, l. ii., epist. liii. (l. c., p. 619).
[227] S. Greg.: *Epist.*, l. ii., epist. lii. (l. c., p. 618).
[228] *Eirenicon*, Postscriptum, p. 310.

centuries the Patriarch of Constantinople had manifested a strong tendency to fall into schism: he aimed, on the one hand, at emancipating himself from the jurisdiction of the Apostolic See; on the other, at subjecting to his power all the churches of the Greek empire.[229] The history of the fourth and fifth centuries supplies such evident proof of this assertion as to dispense us from any lengthened demonstration.[230] Such being the state of things, we need not wonder if St. Gregory opposed with all his might the assumption of this title, and called it a puff of arrogance, a proud, a blasphemous name, the corruption of the Catholic faith, a harbinger of Antichrist, the invention of the first apostate, &c. &c. It should nevertheless be understood that when St. Gregory passed so severe a sentence on the assumption of the title, he considered it not only as implying order, but also jurisdiction. In illustration of this we may use one of the passages of St. Gregory's letters which are used in the *Eirenicon:* "If one is universal," he writes to Bishop Eusebius, "it remains that you are not bishop."[231] This, too, was one of the reasons for which he refused to assume the title of universal bishop, which, as he often asserts,[232] none of his predecessors had ever assumed, although it had been offered to them by the Council of Chalcedon. And he intimates repeatedly that if the appellation

[229] See on this subject the following section, n. vi., seq.

[230] See Lupus, *Scholia ad Can.*, xxviii., *Conc. Chalced.* (Op., t. ii., p. 109, seq. Venetiis); Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, t. i., *De Patriarch. Constant.*, c. xii., p. 67, seq.; *Vita S. Gregorii*, scripta a Maurinis, l. iii., c. i. (in Op. S. Greg., t. i., p. 248, seq. Edit. Parisiis), &c.

[231] S. Gregorius: *Epist.*, l. ix., epist. lxviii. (Op., t. ii., p. 984).

[232] S. Greg.: *Epist.*, l. v., epist. xviii. (l. c., p. 743); epist. xx. (l. c., p. 749); epist. xliii. (l. c., p. 771); l. viii., epist. xxx. (l. c., p. 919), &c.

of universal is given to him, all other bishops would be deprived of their dignity.[233] He means thereby that should the Pope become universal bishop, by that title he would absorb all the power of the other bishops, and concentrate episcopacy in his one person alone. That would indeed be a subversion of the constitution of the Church and the overthrow of the primacy itself; for the Pope is a bishop, and as such he is the equal merely of every other bishop, his primacy being one of Jurisdiction, not of Order. It is true that the Council of Chalcedon, when offering this title to the Pope,[234] did not intend it to be taken in the meaning which is destructive of the economy of the Church. The *Libelli* in which that term occurs did not contemplate any power of Order, but of Jurisdiction only. Nevertheless, in this second sense of jurisdiction we should again distinguish in that title the right which it imparts, and the honour which it is intended to convey. Now the *Libelli* did not mean to impart to the Pope a new right, especially since the title was not decreed in a *conciliar* form. Besides, we have seen already, and will further prove by fresh evidence, that long before the Council of Chalcedon the Popes had proclaimed and enforced their supreme authority over the whole Church. The council therefore intended to give the Pope a title of honour only, such as might witness to his universal jurisdiction. What, consequently, did St. Gregory decline to assume—the right itself of universal pastor, or the honour of being called by that glorious title? Doubtless he could not reject the right, as he could not fail to know what had been the mind of his predecessors, when he declared the Roman Church

[233] S. Gregorius: l. c.

[234] This title was given to Pope Leo in some *Libelli* presented to the Council of Chalcedon.—See Harduin, *Conc.*, t. ii., pp. 321, 325, 331, 335.

to be entrusted with *cura omnium Ecclesiarum*, and enforced and used his authority—as shall be seen in the fifth section—both over the Greek and the Latin churches. And, indeed, it would have been the most glaring contradiction to refuse on one side the right of supreme jurisdiction, and on the other to exercise it over the whole world. It is surprising that none of the Protestant disputants who have written upon the subject seem to have recognised the inconsistency. St. Gregory, in truth, refused the honour only of that singular title, as he constantly insinuates wherever, in his letters, he speaks of the offer made in the Council of Chalcedon. All the letters quoted in the two foregoing notes prove this—nay, even one of his letters cited in the *Eirenicon* bears testimony to the same effect. "How is it," he says in this letter to the Emperor Maurice, "that while we seek not the glory of this name, though offered to us, yet another presumes to claim it, though not offered?"[235]

VIII. But why then did St. Gregory and his predecessors refuse the title of "universal bishop?" After all we have said on the question, further explanation is hardly needed. They refused this honorary title because they remembered that they were the vicars of Him who has said, "Learn of Me; for I am humble of heart" (St. Matt. xi. 20). Their office was to inspire their fellow-bishops with the same sentiments of humility, and they could not have effectually succeeded in this task, had they coveted so singular a title; they recollected the great lesson taught them by Christ: "He that is greatest among you, let him do as he that serves" (St. Luke xxii. 26). Having refused the title of "universal bishop," they adopted that of *servi servorum Dei*, in order to follow the divine counsel

[235] S. Greg.: *Epist.*, l. v., epist. xx. (l. c., p. 749).

by making themselves the least of all, though superior to all in power and authority. And, certainly, by that mark of humility alone could the Popes check the pride and ambition of the Bishops of Constantinople, who, in opposition to every principle of right and justice, had usurped the title of "universal," extending their authority and their jurisdiction beyond all lawful bounds. How difficult would it have been to overcome the proud stubbornness of the Greek Patriarchs had the Popes shown themselves too fond of titles of honour? Thus humility and prudence induced the Popes to abolish that title, which would have added nothing substantial to their divinely-bestowed authority. In the next section we shall see how the Popes, and Gregory the Great himself, acted on the principle of their divine supremacy, and we shall learn how their authoritative voice was listened to and obeyed in the Universal Church. This will cast such a light on the subject as to defy contradiction on the part of Protestants or schismatics of every shade.

SECTION IV.

THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE EXERCISED OVER, AND ACKNOWLEDGED BY, THE EASTERN CHURCH.—CANON XXVIII. OF CHALCEDON.

I. NO doctrine in the Church of Christ is so clearly deducible from the records of ecclesiastical history as that of the supremacy of the Apostolic See. To deny this doctrine is nothing less than to gainsay the clear testimony of indisputable facts and documents. It is surprising that so many Protestants who pretend to learning seem unaware of the existence of these historical evidences, or at least unable to appreciate their import. But it is yet more strange to see such men labour at drawing darkness from the clear light of history, and throwing into obscurity the fundamental doctrine upon which rests the divine economy of the whole Church. Most Protestants, probably, and the High Church party especially, would not attempt to deny that the Popes in early times exercised a supreme authority over all the Western Church, but they consider that this authority was enjoyed by the Bishops of Rome in their character of Patriarchs of the West, having been invested by the Church itself with supreme power over every particular church within certain boundaries. Further, they would not shrink from acknowledging that the Eastern Church recognised a Papal *primacy*. Thus far they are with us, but they deny that the supreme authority was exercised and acknowledged throughout the whole Church, and they maintain that the Eastern Church, never having admitted the divine right of the supremacy,

has never varied in her doctrines regarding it. The High Church party, therefore, agree with all Protestants in countenancing the Greek schism, which they unanimously attribute to usurpations of the Popes. Dr. Pusey, who cites the words of the schismatic Bishop of Zerniza,[236] seems to be of the same mind. But if history be read in its original sources, it will be seen how much these writers do violence to its evidences, and destroy its teachings. We learn, indeed, from Dr. Overbeck's recent work, that in this the Puseyite party has for an accomplice the schismatic church of the East.[237] But in the present section we hope to show, historical documents in hand, that the divine supremacy was uniformly and universally acknowledged in the Eastern Church until the time of its final separation from the Catholic communion, and that the rulers of the East, whether ecclesiastical or civil, never disputed the supreme authority of the Pope.

II. It cannot be questioned that in the fourth century the supreme authority of the Apostolic See was fully acknowledged in the Oriental Church. As soon as the heresy of Apollinaris and his disciple Timotheus arose at Antioch, the neighbouring bishops sent letters to Rome to Pope Damasus, requesting the deposition of these heretics, both of whom were bishops in the Eastern Patriarchate. Pope Damasus applauded the bishops for having given to the Apostolic See the honour which was due to it.[238] He afterwards declares

[236] *Eirenicon*, p. 63.

[237] *Catholic Orthodoxy and Anglo-Catholicism.* By J. F. Overbeck, D.D. London, 1866.

[238] S. Damasus: *Epist.* xiv., n. 1 (Coustant., p. 571). "Quod debitam Apostolicæ Sedi reverentiam exhibet caritas vestra, in eo vobis ipsis plurimum præstatis, filii carissimi."—Other facts demonstrative of Papal supremacy during the first three centuries, will be adduced in the volume in which the infallibility of the Pope

that Apollinaris and Timotheus had already been deposed by the sentence of the Apostolic See; that he had once for all issued a confession of faith; and finally, that, "Whoever professes himself a Christian must keep what has been handed down from the Apostles."[239] We here see that even before the Oriental bishops had applied to Pope Damasus, two of their brethren had been condemned and deposed by him. In virtue of what power was this done? Doubtless, in virtue of that power of holding the helm which, as he himself intimates, belonged to the bishop who sat in the Chair of the Apostle Peter,[240] and by no other authority. Damasus restored the Patriarch Peter to his see of Alexandria when he had been deposed by the intrigues of a certain Lucius.[241] And in this he followed the example of his predecessor, Julius; for when the five banished bishops—St. Athanasius of Alexandria, St. Paul of Constantinople, Asclepias of Gaza, Marcellus of Ancyra in Galatia, and Lucius of Hadrianople—being driven from their sees by their opponents, came to Rome, and appealed to the authority of this Pontiff, Julius judged their cause with supreme authority, and finding their profession of faith to be in harmony with his own, he sent them back with his authoritative

will be treated. For the present, we refer our readers to H. Hagemann, *Die Römische Kirche, und ihr Einfluss auf Disciplin und Dogma*, pp. 128, 134, 439, &c. Freiburg, 1864.

[239] S. Damasus: n. 2. "Scitote igitur quod profanum illum Timotheum Apollinarii hæretici discipulum cum impio ejus dogmate damnavimus." *Ibid*, n. 3, "Quid igitur depositionem Timothei a me denuo postulatis, qui et hic judicio Sedis Apostolicæ . . . depositus est una cum magistro suo Apollinario?" See the *Profession of Faith* in Coustant., p. 518, seq.

[240] S. Damasus: n. 1. "Etsi maxime in Sancta Ecclesia in qua S. Apostolus sedens docuit, docet nos quodam modo clavum tenere, quem regendum suscepimus," &c.

[241] Socrates: *Hist. Eccles.*, l. iv., c. xxxvii. Edit. Valesii, p. 254.

letters, and restored them to their sees. But Socrates and Sozomen, who relate this fact, remark that Julius acted in this according to the prerogative of the Roman See, since, on account of the dignity of his See, the care of all belonged to him.[242] Thus, two of the earliest historians of the Oriental Church bear witness to the fact of the exercise of the supreme Papal authority over the Universal Church. They acknowledge, as a maxim universally received, that the care of all belongs to the Pope; and they attribute to that supreme authority the right of judging the causes of the bishops of the East, and of deposing them from their sees, or restoring them when unjustly deprived. We here have strong evidence that the Papal supremacy was acknowledged in the Oriental Church.

III. But proofs still more cogent are not wanting. In the Council of Ephesus held against Nestorius, the doctrine of the supremacy over the whole Church is asserted as plainly as possible, by word and act. St. Cyril, Patriarch of the most eminent see of the East, applied to Pope Celestine against Nestorius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, who, like heresiarchs of every age, had already appealed to the Pope, in the hope of gaining authoritative support for his doctrines. St. Cyril, writing to the Bishop of Rome, uses the following expressions: "We have not openly and publicly separated from communion with Nestorius before making known the whole matter to your Holiness. Be pleased then to prescribe what you think right to be done. Whether it behoves us to persevere in communion with him, or to declare openly that communion is impossible with one who fosters and teaches

[242] Socrates: *Hist. Eccles.*, l. ii., c. viii., p. 91. Sozomen: l. iii., c. viii. Edit. Valesii., p. 507. The words of Sozomen are as follows:—Οἷα δὲ τῶν πάντων κηδεμονίας αὐτῷ προσηκούσης διὰ τὴν ἀξίαν τοῦ θρόνου.

doctrines so erroneous."[243] Thus the Patriarch of Alexandria does not take any effectual step against the heresiarch until he has heard the determination of the Bishop of Rome, and received orders from him. And at the same time he declares it to be "An ancient custom of the Churches, that all affairs of such a nature should be communicated to the Pope's Holiness, to whom, of sheer necessity, he feels compelled to write."[244] Pope Celestine, even before having received the letter of St. Cyril, judged Nestorius, condemned his errors, ordered him, under pain of excommunication from the whole Catholic Church, to subscribe the profession of the Catholic faith, and by writing solemnly to condemn his novel doctrines. At the same time he writes to St. Cyril: "In virtue of authority delegated to you by our See, and acting in our stead, and by our commission, you will execute our sentence with exact severity."[245] We cannot fail to recognise, in the words of Celestine, the language in which a superior addresses an inferior. The Pontiff, conscious of his full authority in the Church, passes a solemn sentence, and deputes, on the one hand, a Patriarch to see to its execution; on the other, he puts forth a confession of faith, and, under threat of excommunication, calls upon a second Patriarch to adhere to the doctrine so set forth. This

[243] *In Conc. Ephes.*, pt. i., cap. xiv. (Labbe, t. iii., p. 893). Οὐ πρότερον δὲ τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν κοινωνίας ἐκβάλλομεν ἑαυτοὺς μετὰ παρρησίας πρὶν ἂν ταῦτα τῇ σῇ θεοσεβείᾳ ἀνακοινωσώμεθα διὸ δὴ καταξίωσον τυπῶσαι τὸ δοκοῦν, καὶ πότερόν ποτε χρὴ κοινωνεῖν αὐτῷ, ἢ λοιπὸν ἀπειπεῖν μετὰ παρρησίας, ὅτι τοιαῦτα φρονοῦντι καὶ διδάσκοντι οὐδεὶς κοινωνεῖ.

[244] L. c., p. 889. τὰ μακρὰ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἔθη πείθουσιν, ἀνακοινοῦσθαι τῇ σῇ ὁσιότητι.

[245] In Labbe, l. c., pp. 898, 899. "Quamobrem nostræ sedis auctoritate adscita, nostraque vice et loco cum potestate usus ejusmodi non absque exquisita severitate sententiam exequeris," &c.

he does, not as a bishop giving friendly counsel to a brother bishop, but as the head of the Church, efficaciously enforcing his orders, and threatening a guilty Patriarch with exclusion from Catholic communion. We here find a plain evidence of Papal supremacy. Moreover, the Council of Ephesus, which assembled in the following year, in the first session promulgated the Papal excommunication against Nestorius and deposed him; the Fathers of the Council declaring that they "Were compelled to pass that sentence by the canons and by the letters of their most holy father and fellow-labourer, Celestine, Bishop of the Church of the Romans."[246] In truth, the Acts of the Council of Ephesus furnish at every step a clear demonstration of the Papal supremacy. With what reverence did the assembled Fathers listen to the letter addressed by Celestine to the synod; with what unanimous approval did they hear that the Pope had already decreed the condemnation and excommunication of Nestorius![247] Then Philip, a priest, legate of the Roman See, returned thanks to the synod, because, as became holy members, they had, by their voices and acclamations, united themselves to their holy head; "For," continued he, "your blessednesses are not ignorant that the holy Apostle Peter is the head of the entire faith, and chief, likewise, of the Apostles."[248] So also in the third session the legate again made a solemn declaration of the supremacy of the Holy See. "We do not doubt," he says, "nay, rather it is a fact well known in all ages, that the holy and blessed Peter, Prince and Head of the Apostles, Pillar of the Faith, Foundation of the Catholic Church, received from our Lord Jesus Christ,

[246] *Conc. Ephes.*, pt. ii., act. i. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1077).
[247] *Ibid.*, act. ii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1147).
[248] *Ibid.* (Labbe, l. c., p. 1150).

the Saviour and Redeemer of the human race, the keys of the kingdom, and that to him power was given to loose and to bind sins. And Peter has, in his successors, lived and exercised judgment up to this present day, and for all future time will live and judge. Wherefore the successor of St. Peter, and his representative in the regular order, our holy and blessed Pope Celestine, has sent us to the synod to supply his place."[149] When the legate spoke thus no dissentient voice was raised in the synod, for the doctrine of the Papal supremacy was no novelty in the Church, but a matter universally recognised.

IV. After all this, it is strange to find a passage of the letter addressed by Pope Celestine to the Council of Ephesus quoted by Dr. Pusey as evidence of the perfect equality of all bishops, and their absolute independence of the Apostolic See. "Pope Celestine declares," he says, "that the charge of teaching has descended from the Apostles *equally* upon all bishops. We are all engaged in it by *an hereditary right;* all we who have come in their stead preach the name of our Lord to all the countries of the world, according to what was said to them—'Go ye and teach all nations.'"[250] The strength of this argument lies in the italicised adverb *equally*, which word is due merely to a false translation, for in the original text we have *in commune*—"in common;" this is rightly represented in the Greek by τὸ κοινόν.[251] The genuine import of this passage expresses the teaching of St. Cyprian and of the other holy Fathers, who represent the Episcopate as one office, in which all the bishops share *in solidum*. But neither these Fathers, nor Celestine himself, intend

[249] *Conc. Ephes.*, act. iii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1154).
[250] *Eirenicon*, Postscriptum, p. 307.
[251] *Conc. Ephes.*, act. ii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1144).

thereby to deny the existence of gradations of jurisdiction in the episcopal body. On the contrary, Celestine, in connection with this very matter, supplies irrefragable proofs of his supremacy over the whole Church. For besides the passage which we have already quoted, we find that on sending his legates to the Synod of Ephesus with the letter cited by Dr. Pusey, he instructed them that, "They should take care that the authority of the Apostolic See be maintained." In other words, their instructions amounted to this: They were to be present at the council; if a dispute arose, they were to pass judgment on the issue, and to hold themselves aloof from contention and dispute.[252] Celestine's orders were exactly executed, not only by the legates, but by the council itself.[253] This is not the style of one who believes himself to be merely the *equal* of the bishops who sat in the council. But even the enemies of the Catholic faith in the East solemnly confessed at that time the doctrine for which we contend. Eleutherius, Bishop of Tyana, and Helladius, Bishop of Tarsus, wrote not long after to Pope Sixtus against the decrees of Ephesus; and in their letters they bear the clearest testimony to the supreme and divine authority of the Apostolic See. They styled the Pope "another Moses," "another Peter," "the divinely-appointed ruler of the Church;" they commemorate the triumphs of his See over heresy and infidelity; they appeal to him to stretch a saving hand, and to *command* an inquiry to be made into all the irregular proceedings of the council.[254]

V. But the divine supremacy of the Pope was no

[252] *Commonitorium Papæ Cœlestini*, &c. (Coustant., p. 1152).

[253] The Acts of the First and Second Sessions were read to the legates, according to their demand, and were approved and signed by them.—*Conc. Ephes.*, act. iii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1158, seq.).

[254] *Epistola Eleutherii et Helladii Episcoporum* (Gallandi, t. ix., p. 523).

less acknowledged at the time of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. We do not know how far other Anglican divines agree with the judgment passed by Mr. Palmer on Pope St. Leo, of whom he says that his "continual object was, to assert that St. Peter still lived in his successors, and that all the promises made to him were also made to the Bishop of Rome."[255] Mr. Palmer forgets that besides Pope Leo, the Fathers of Ephesus, as we have just seen, and those of Chalcedon, as we shall see presently, were convinced that St. Peter still lived in his successors; he even explicitly denies that the Oriental Church fully and authentically acknowledged the power which St. Leo assumed and exercised. But fortunately the historical records of the time are eloquent witnesses as to the matter. Did the authoritative language of St. Leo ever receive any manner of contradiction from the Oriental Church, either by the mouth of individual bishops, or by that of the General Council of Chalcedon? Pope Leo solemnly and frequently inculcates on the Eastern Church his divinely-conferred supremacy; and emperors and bishops as openly acknowledge it by deeds, no less than by words. As, for example, the Emperor Theodosius, in a public decree;[256] and the Emperor Marcian, in a letter addressed by him to St. Leo on his ascending the imperial throne.[257] Moreover the great Pontiff orders Anatolius,

[255] Palmer: *Letter* v. *to Card. Wiseman*, sec. 4, p. 48.

[256] *Constitutio Imp. Theodosii et Valentiniani* (In Codice Theod. Leg. Nov., l. i., tit. xxiv., t. vi. Edit. Gothof., Lipsiæ, p. 67. Et in Op. S. Leonis, t. i., p. 642. Edit. Ballerini). "Cum Sedis Apostolicæ primatum S. Petri meritum qui princeps est episcopalis coronæ et Romanæ dignitas civitatis, sacræ etiam Synodi firmaverit auctoritas, ne quid præter auctoritatem sedis istius inlicitum præsumptio attemptare nitatur."

[257] *Epist. Marciani Imp. ad Leonem Papam* (inter Epist. S. Leonis, t. i., Op. Edit. Ball., pp. 1017—19). "Tuam sanctitatem principatum divinæ fidei possidentem sacris litteris in principio justum credimus alloquendum."

Patriarch of Constantinople, to abstain from reciting at the altar the names of those who had taken part in the infamous Pseudo-Synod of Ephesus.[258] He commands that Aëtius, a priest unjustly deprived of the dignity of archdeacon by the Patriarch of Constantinople, should be restored to his office. He decrees the degradation of the heretic Andrew, on whom the same dignity had been bestowed. Anatolius not only faithfully executes the orders—*mandata*—of the Pope, but declares that he would never resist them, whatever they might be.[259] St. Leo acts in like manner, and with the same supreme authority, in the case of Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, who, having been deposed, appeals to the Roman Pontiff, "For on all accounts," he says, in his letter, "the Primacy justly belongs to you. Therefore," continues he, "I now await the sentence of your Apostolic See, and I pray and entreat your Holiness to assist me, appealing to your just and equitable tribunal, and to command me to come to you, that I may show how my teaching follows the footsteps of the Apostles."[260] Theodoret was accordingly judged by the Apostolic tribunal, and restored to his see, and was then enabled to take his seat at the Council of Chalcedon; when, therefore, he was introduced into the Council, the assembled bishops declared that he had a right to enter, "because the Most Holy Archbishop Leo had restored him to his bishopric."[261] As regards the Patriarchate of Alexandria, the authority exerted by St. Leo in

[258] S. Leo: *Epist.* lxxx., *ad Anatolium Patriarch.*, c. ii. (Op., t. i., p. 1051).

[259] *Epist. Anatolii Patriarchi ad Leonem Papam*, capp. i., ii., inter Epist. S. Leonis, epist. cxxxii. (Op., S. Leonis, t. i., p. 1262), et *Epist.* cxxxv. *S. Leonis ad Anatolium*, c. ii. (l. c., p. 1278).

[260] *Epist. Theodoriti Cyr. ad S. Leonem*, capp. i., v., inter Epist. S. Leonis, epist. lii. (l. c. pp. 941—947).

[261] ἐπειδὴ ἀποκατέστησεν αὐτῷ τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ὁ ἁγιώτατος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Λέων.—*Conc. Chalced.*, act. i. (Labbe, t. iv., p. 873).

every vicissitude of that Church evidently shows that the supremacy of the Apostolic See was fully acknowledged at that time throughout Egypt. As soon as Dioscorus was appointed Patriarch of Alexandria, Pope Leo reminds him of the supremacy of the See of Rome; that St. Mark was the disciple of St. Peter; and that he, therefore, could not bring into his Church regulations different from those which St. Peter had decreed for the Roman Church. He adds: "I cannot suffer that while professing to belong to the same body and to hold one faith, we should differ in anything whatever; so that the regulations of the Teacher should seem to be at variance with those of the disciples." And therefore, in the tone of a superior, he intimates his will to Dioscorus, and obliges him to the observance of those laws which the Fathers had laid down.[262] No less authoritative is the manner in which the same Pope declares both to the Emperor Leo and to Gennadius, Patriarch of Constantinople, that Timothy the Cat must be expelled from the See of Alexandria and deprived of his dignity, even though he present an orthodox confession of faith; and on that account he orders the election of a new Patriarch.[263] But passing over these instances, let us turn to the Council of Chalcedon, where the whole Oriental Church was assembled. Let us see what were the views expressed by the synod with regard to the Papal supremacy, and whether it did not plainly acknow-

[262] S. Leo: *Epist.* ix., *ad Dioscorum Alex. Episc.*, c. i. (Op., t. i., p. 629). "Quod ergo a patribus nostris propensiore cura novimus esse servatum, a vobis volumus custodiri," &c. Et c. ii. (l. c., p. 631). "Ut autem in omnibus observantia concordet, illud quoque volumus custodiri."

[263] S. Leo: *Epist.* clvi., *ad Leonem Imp.* (l. c., p. 1321, seq.); *Epist.* clvii., *ad Anatolium* (l. c., p. 1326); *Epist.* clxiv., *ad Leon. Imp.* (l. c., p. 1344); *Epist.* clxix., *ad eundem* (l. c., p. 1431); et *Epist.* clxx., *ad Gennadium, Patriarch. Const.* (l. c., p. 1433).

ledge the Pope's supreme divine power over the Universal Church. The Acts of the Synod leave no doubt upon the point. In fact, in the first session, Paschasinus, Bishop of Lilybæum, and legate of the Apostolic See, together with the other legates, stood in the midst of the council, and said, "We have orders from the most blessed and Apostolic Bishop of the City of Rome, who is the head of all the Churches, vouchsafing to set forth that Dioscorus must not sit in the council, and that should he attempt to do so he must be expelled."[264] When the assembly of the bishops asked what was the charge against him, the legates replied, "That he had dared to hold a synod without the authority of the Apostolic See, which was never done, and never allowed."[265] The legates asserted most plainly in these words the claims of the Apostolic See. Yet none of the Eastern bishops, who constituted the main body the assembly, urged the least objection to these claims, or questioned their validity. All submitted in silence to the orders of the Apostolic See. Dioscorus came forth as a criminal; and his crimes being sufficiently proved, the legates were asked by the council to pronounce a final sentence in the name of the Roman Pontiff. Paschasinus, therefore, as the Pope's vicegerent, pronounced as follows: First, he granted pardon, in Pope Leo's name, to those who had unwillingly taken part in the *Latrocinium* of Ephesus, and who had since continued obedient to the Most Holy Archbishop Leo, and to every most holy and œcumenical council.[266]

[264] *Conc. Chalced.*, act. i. (Labbe, t. iv., p. 863).

[265] L. c., p. 866.

[266] *Con. Chalced.*, act. iii. (Labbe, t. iv., p. 1303). "Illis Apostolica Sedes veniam præstitit de iis quæ ibi (in Conciliabulo Ephesino) non voluntarie ab eis gesta sunt, qui et hactenus permanserunt obedientes sanctissimo Archiepiscopo Leoni et omni sancto et universali concilio."

Then he proceeded to pronounce the condemnation of Dioscorus: "The Most Holy and Blessed Leo, Archbishop of the great and elder Rome, through us and the present most holy synod, together with the thrice-blessed and most glorious Apostle Peter, who is the rock and support of the Catholic Church, and the foundation of the orthodox faith, has deprived Dioscorus of his episcopacy, and has removed him from all sacerdotal rank."[267] One must be blinded by inveterate prejudice not to see in this fact the supremacy of the Apostolic See fully exercised, and acknowledged by all the bishops of the Eastern Church, who, by subscribing the Acts of the Council, manifested how unreserved was their concurrence in the views expressed in this judgment.[268] They were each and all of them convinced that St. Peter lived and spoke in his successor, and that the Pope had supreme authority over the whole Church of Christ. Therefore, when in the second session of the council St. Leo's dogmatic letter was read, all the assembled bishops unanimously exclaimed, "This is the faith of the Apostles; this is the faith of the Fathers. This do we and all the orthodox believe. Anathema to him who believes it not. Peter has spoken by Leo."[269] Moreover, in the synodical letters addressed by the Fathers to Pope Leo, speaking

[267] *Conc. Chalced.*, l. c., p. 1306. "Unde sanctissimus et beatissimus Archiepiscopus magnæ et senioris Romæ Leo per nos et per præsentem sanctam Synodum una cum ter beatissimo et omni laude digno B. Petro Apostolo, qui est petra et crepido Catholicæ Ecclesiæ et rectæ fidei fundamentum, nudavit eum tam episcopatus dignitate, quam etiam ab omni sacerdotali alienavit ministerio."

[268] See the subscriptions of all the bishops (l. c., pp. 1306—1335).

[269] *Conc. Chalced.*, act. ii. (Labbe, t. iv., p. 1236). αὕτη ἡ πίστις τῶν πατέρων, αὕτη ἡ πίστις τῶν Ἀποστόλων, πάντες οὕτω πιστεύομεν οἱ ὀρθόδοξοι οὕτω πιστεύουσιν, ἀνάθεμα τῷ μὴ οὕτω πιστεύοντι. Πέτρος διὰ Λέοντος ταῦτα ἐξεφώνησεν.

of Dioscorus, they say, "He turned his insane rage against him to whom our divine Saviour entrusted the care of the vineyard—that is, against your Apostolic Holiness; and he attempted to inflict a sentence of excommunication upon you, whose endeavour it is to make the body of the Church to be one."[270] It was then, as is evident, the conviction of the Fathers of Chalcedon, that the Pope had received from Christ the charge of the vineyard, or of the whole Church. And so we obtain a clear proof of the acknowledgment by the Eastern Church of the supremacy of the Roman See.

VI. But Dr. Overbeck, after having described the Papacy as "a naïve and unhistoric conception,"[271] attacks the argument in favour of the supremacy drawn by Mr. Allies from the guardianship of the vine, which, according to the Council of Chalcedon, was entrusted to Leo by the Saviour. After quoting a passage of Mr. Allies' pamphlet,[272] Dr. Overbeck exclaims, as if in great surprise, "The very same council, which issued the famous Canon xxviii., advocating the Roman supremacy!"[273] "Wonder," says an Italian proverb, "is the daughter of ignorance."[274] Had Dr. Overbeck studied the Acts of the Synod of Chalcedon, he would have blushed to betray such surprise. For what has the Canon xxviii. of Chalcedon to do with the *guardianship of the vine?* Let us hear Mr. Overbeck himself—"It is a hermeneutical rule," he says, "that a controverted

[270] *Conc. Chalc.*, pt. iii., c. ii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1776). *Ἔτι καὶ κατ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ τῆς ἀμπέλου τὴν φυλακὴν παρὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἐπιτετραμμένου τὴν μανίαν ἐξέτεινε, λέγομεν δή, τῆς σῆς ὁσιότητος, καὶ ἀκοινωνησίαν κατὰ τοῦ τὸ σῶμα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἑνοῦν σπουδάσαντος ἐμελέτησε.*

[271] Overbeck: Op. cit., p. 121.

[272] Allies: *Dr. Pusey and the Ancient Church*, p. 68, seq.

[273] Overbeck: l. c., p. 122.

[274] "La maraviglia dell' ignoranza è figlia."

passage of an author is to be interpreted by other plain passages of the same. Well, the Canon xxviii. is unmistakably plain; is an impregnable bulwark against Papal encroachments, and shows fully the consciousness of the Fathers that, in opposition to Rome, they must keep on the defensive, or they are sure to lose their position. From this feeling, the necessity of the canon arose. We know that the Pope and the Romish Church did not approve of this canon. But what was to be done? No subsequent œcumenical council cancelled the canon, and it obtains up to this day its place in the Canon Law of the Eastern Church, whether orthodox or Papal. Why has not the Pope used his divine power (if the council knew such a thing) to abolish it? Now, these very same Fathers call Pope Leo '*the very person entrusted by the Saviour with the guardianship of the vine.*'"[275] A superficial acquaintance with the history of the canon in question, will show that its true bearing is entirely different from what it is here represented to be, and we are glad to be led to the consideration of this subject, as it furnishes us with one of the best arguments in favour of the Papal supremacy. We, therefore, accept the Canon xxviii. of Chalcedon as the exponent of the expression, "guardianship of the vine." Dr. Overbeck qualifies the canon as unmistakably plain; and certainly its meaning can easily be discovered in the Acts of the Sixteenth Session of the Synod of Chalcedon; but a few preliminary remarks will be useful, in order to set before our readers a more complete view of the subject. It is well known that, at the time when the seat of the empire was first established at Constantinople, the episcopal see of that city was subordinate to the metropolitan church of Heraclea. The patronage of the Emperors raised the see to the rank

[275] L. c.

of an archbishopric; but it remained subject to the Patriarch of Alexandria from the time of Theodosius I. to the First General Council of Constantinople, by which (Canon ii.) it was raised to the rank of a Patriarchal see. The greatness of the Byzantine empire, and the privileges of its capital, puffed up the Bishops of Constantinople with pride and ambition. They could not bear to see their ecclesiastical jurisdiction restrained within the narrow boundaries of their own diocese; much less could they endure the precedence of the sees of Alexandria and Antioch, which a decree of the œcumenical council placed next in rank after the See of Rome. Their wishes and their efforts were, therefore, constantly directed to extending the limits of their jurisdiction, and to exalting their see to the rank of a Patriarchate, second to none but Rome. They endeavoured by every means to extend their power over the sees of Ephesus and Cæsarea, in the Asiatic and Pontic dioceses, and to establish Patriarchal jurisdiction over the metropolitans of Asia, of Thrace, and of Pontus.[276] Doubtless, the Byzantine Bishop already enjoyed a precedence of honour, granted to him on account of the majesty of the imperial capital.[277] He had, also, exercised his authority in the ordination of some metropolitans, who, out of deference to the first city of the empire, had not refused to be subordinate to the Bishop of Constantinople. But the honorary precedence over the Patriarchs of Alexandria and of Antioch, decreed to him in the Third Canon of the Synod of Constantinople, had not been acknowledged by the Roman Pontiff. This we learn from a letter of Boniface I.[278]

[276] On this matter see Le Quien, who treats the history of the Patriarchate at length in his *Oriens Christianus*, t. i., capp. ii.—v., pp. 10—30.

[277] *Conc. Chalced.*, act. i. (Labbe, l. c., p. 889).

[278] Bonifacius I.: *Epist.* xv., nn. 4, 5 (Coustant., pp. 1041-42).

Hence, Anatolius, the Bishop of Constantinople, at the time of the Œcumenical Synod of Chalcedon, sought to obtain its sanction for the Patriarchal prerogatives claimed by his see over the dioceses of Asia and Pontus, and the churches of Thrace; and, also, a confirmation of his honorary precedence over the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch. No occasion could be more favourable to the designs of the Byzantine Bishop; for the Patriarch of Alexandria had been condemned and deposed; Maximus, Patriarch of Antioch, had been ordained by Anatolius, and was, therefore, devoted to his interests. Moreover, the see of Ephesus was then vacant, and the other metropolitans of Asia, Thrace, and Pontus, were most favourable to him and his views. In fact, the Synod of Chalcedon had already sanctioned some of the Patriarchal privileges coveted by the see of Constantinople.[279] But Anatolius aimed higher. He wished to have the Patriarchate fully and canonically erected, with plenary jurisdiction over Asia, Thrace, and Pontus, and precedence granted to it, not only over the newly established Patriarch of Jerusalem,[280] but also over those of Alexandria and Antioch. Such was the real purpose of the Canon xxviii. of Chalcedon. If we examine the words and the bearing of the canon, the meaning will appear plain and unmistakable; but far from being "an impregnable bulwark against Papal encroachments," it will, on the contrary, both in its wording and by the circumstances wherein it originated, afford a strong proof of the divinely established primacy of the Apostolic See.

VII. The canon in question runs as follows:—"We, following in all things the decisions of the holy Fathers,

[279] *Conc. Chalced.*, act. xv., can. ix. et xvii. (Labbe, l. c., pp. 1685—88).

[280] *Ibid.*, act. vii. (Labbe, l. c., pp. 1517—19).

and acknowledging the Canon of the 150 most religious bishops which has just been read, do also determine and decree the same things respecting the privileges of the most holy City of Constantinople, the new Rome. For the Fathers properly gave the primacy to the throne of the elder Rome, because that was the imperial city. And the 150 most religious bishops, being moved with the same intention, gave equal privileges to the most holy throne of new Rome, judging with reason, that the city, which was honoured with the sovereignty and senate, and which enjoyed equal privileges with the elder royal Rome, should also be magnified like her in ecclesiastical matters, being the second after her. And (we also decree) that the metropolitans only of the Pontic, Asiatic, and Thracian dioceses, including the bishops of the aforesaid dioceses, who are amongst the barbarians, shall be ordained by the above-mentioned most holy throne of the most holy Church of Constantinople; each metropolitan of the aforesaid dioceses ordaining the bishops of the province, as had been declared by the divine canons; but the metropolitans themselves of the said dioceses shall, as has been said, be ordained by the Bishop of Constantinople, the proper elections being made according to custom, and reported to him."[281] This is the famous Canon xxviii. of Chalcedon, to which so much importance has been attached. It is evidently built on the above-mentioned Third Canon of Constantinople, which will help us to determine its true meaning. The words of the latter canon are the following:—"The Bishop of Constantinople shall have the privileges of honour (τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς) after the Bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is the new Rome."[282] The Synod of Constantinople does not

[281] *Conc. Chalced.*, act. xv. (Labbe, l. c., pp. 1692-3).
[282] *Conc. Constantinop.*, can. iii. (Labbe, t. ii., p. 1138).

hint, even remotely, at any extension of the jurisdiction of the Byzantine Bishop: it regards only privileges of honour—τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς. But the Canon of Chalcedon employs exactly the same words. It cannot, therefore, mean anything like jurisdiction, but only a precedence of honour, which was given to the Bishop of Constantinople after the Bishop of Rome (μετὰ τὸν τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον). Hence, in the Canon of Chalcedon, as well as in that of Constantinople, there is no question whatever concerning the primacy of jurisdiction: this belongs to the Pope alone; it treats merely of a prerogative of honour and precedence, the highest degree of which belongs to the Pope as Patriarch of the West, and next after whom ranked the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch. According to the Canon of Chalcedon, the Bishop of Constantinople, far from disputing the Pope's supreme jurisdiction over the whole Church, did not even dispute his pre-eminence of honour: he merely sought to rank between the Patriarch of Alexandria and the Pope, and to obtain the precedence, previously acknowledged, belonging to the former. Nor had the Fathers of Chalcedon any other intention in this canon. The Canons of Nicæa and Constantinople concerning the prerogatives of the Patriarchal sees, were read after the protest on the part of Leo's legates against the reading, and the Fathers having expressed their views on the subject, the judges of the synod proceeded to sum up the decision of the whole council in the following words:—"The primacy (τὰ πρωτεῖα) and the chief honour must by all means be preserved to the Archbishop of old Rome, and the Archbishop of the imperial City of Constantinople, new Rome, should enjoy the same privileges of honour. He ought also to have the power to ordain of his own authority the metropolitans in the Asiatic, Pontic, and Thracian dioceses," &c. Whereupon all the bishops cried out

at once that they ratified this decision as in conformity with their judgments.[283] From this we are able to show clearly what was the mind of the Fathers of Chalcedon in framing the Canon xxviii. Far from intending by the act to diminish the prerogatives of the Roman Pontiff, they asserted a determination to maintain these prerogatives in full force. They did not by their decree assign to the Bishop of Constantinople any share in the supreme jurisdiction of the Pope: they acknowledged that τὰ πρωτεῖα, the primacy in the Church, belonged to the Pope, and to the Pope alone; while they accurately distinguished from this, the pre-eminence of honour (τὴν ἐξαίρετον τιμήν), which, also, they acknowledged to belong to the Roman See. They conferred on the Byzantine Bishop no primacy of authority, but merely the prerogative of honour (τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς). Hence, in enacting the Canon xxviii., the Fathers of Chalcedon had no thought of erecting an impregnable bulwark against Papal encroachments, as Dr. Overbeck asserts: their only aim was to bestow a privilege of honour, at the same time that they confessed the supremacy of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, received by him, not as a grant, but as the divine inheritance of the successor of St. Peter.[284] In the very act of issuing the canon, they did not regard themselves as competent to legislate upon the matter without the sanction of the Papal authority. They, therefore, addressed a synodical letter to St. Leo; and in it entreated him, with every mark of veneration and of submission to his authority, that he, as their Father, would be generous towards his children, and grant them the confirmation of that canon, which expressed the unanimous wish of the Oriental Church.[285]

[283] *Conc. Chalced.*, act. xv. (Labbe, t. iv., p. 1756, seq.).

[284] *Relatio Synodica Conc. Chalced. ad Leonem Papam*, pt. iii. (Labbe, l. c., p. 1774, seq.).

[285] *Ibid.*, p. 1777, seq.

With the view of inclining the Pontiff to give his consent, the Patriarch Anatolius himself,[286] the Emperor Marcian,[287] and the Empress Pulcheria,[288] addressed letters and entreaties to Pope Leo in favour of the canon. An attentive perusal of these humble and submissive requests will sufficiently show that Pope Leo, in the judgment of all the Oriental Bishops, was the successor of St. Peter, the vicar of Christ, the supreme ruler of the Universal Church; that it therefore depended on him to rescind the Canons of Nicæa, to subject the Bishops of Thrace, Pontus, and Asia, to the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of the imperial city of the East, and to raise him above the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch. The Fathers of Chalcedon knew well that without the sanction of the Pope no law would have Catholic authority in the Church; and they also knew that the will of an absolute superior can be inclined by prayer and submission alone; they therefore had recourse to submission and prayer, pleading their cause before Pope Leo, whom they owned as their own superior in the Universal Church. To judge then by Canon xxviii., the "guardianship of the vine" must be understood in the sense adopted by Mr. Allies and by all Catholics.

VIII. "But why," says Dr. Overbeck, "has not the Pope used his divine power (if the council knew such a thing) to abolish it?" How is it, we ask, that Dr. Overbeck is ignorant of the facts of the case? Pope Leo unquestionably did act in the very manner here suggested. The Canon xxviii. was not only opposed in the synod

[286] *Epistola Anatolii*, inter Epist. S. Leonis, epist. ci. (Op., t. i., p. 1121).

[287] *Epistola Marciani*, inter Epist. S. Leonis, epist. c., c. iii. (Op., l. c., p. 1114).

[288] See *Epist.* cv., *S. Leonis ad Pulcheriam* (Op., l. c., p. 1153).

by the legates of Leo,[289] but it was directly and explicitly annulled by the Pope, in virtue of his divine and supreme authority in the Church. In proof of which we set before the reader the very words of Pope Leo in their original language: "Consensiones," he says, "Episcoporum, Sanctorum Canonum apud Nicæam regulis repugnantes, unita nobiscum vestræ fidei pietate in irritum mittimus, et per auctoritatem Beati Petri Apostoli generali prorsus definitione cassamus."[290] Thus did Pope Leo annul the decision unanimously come to by the Fathers in the Fifteenth Session of Chalcedon, strike their canon out of the ecclesiastical code, and when so doing, declare that he acted by the authority of the Prince of the Apostles. He expressed these sentiments with Apostolic energy in his letters to the Synod of Chalcedon,[291] to the Patriarch of Antioch,[292] to the Emperor Marcian,[293] and to Anatolius, Bishop of Constantinople;[294] he even required the latter to express in writing his submission to the decision of the Roman See,[295] and Anatolius did not delay to forward to Rome the documents required.[296] The Emperor himself could not refrain from praising the Apostolic

[289] *Conc. Chalced.*, act. xvi. (Labbe, t. iv., p. 1748, seq.).

[290] S. Leo: *Epist.* cv., *ad Pulcheriam Imp.*, c. iii. (Op., l. c., p. 1157).

[291] S. Leo: *Epist.* cxiv., c. ii. (Op., l. c., p. 1197, seq.).

[292] S. Leo: *Epist.* cxix., capp. iii.—v. (Op., l. c., p. 1214, seq.).

[293] S. Leo: *Epist.* civ., cxxviii., cxxxiv., *ad Marcianum Imp.*, (Op., l. c., pp. 1143, 1249, 1274).

[294] S. Leo: *Epist.* xiv., *ad Anatolium* (Op., l. c., p. 1157, seq.).

[295] S. Leo: *Epist.* cxxvii., *ad Julianum Episc.*, c. iii. (l. c., p. 1249); *Epist.* cxxviii., *ad Marc. Imp.* (l. c., p. 1250); *Epist.* cxxxiv., *ad eundem*, c. i. (l. c., p. 1275).

[296] *Epist. Anatolii Episc. ad Leonem Papam*, inter Epist. S. Leonis, epist. cxxxii. (Op., l. c., p. 1261). S. Leo: *Epist.* cxxxv., *ad Anat.* (l. c., p. 1277, seq.); *Epist.* cxxxvi., *ad Marc. Imp.* (l. c., p. 1280).

firmness of the Pontiff in refusing a suit which had the support of the imperial influence.[297] What, then, became of the canon? It needed no other general council to annul it, and it never obtained a place in the Canon Law either of the West or of the East. Theodoret did not insert it in his *Synagogé*, nor do Theodorus Lector, nor Joannes Scholasticus mention it in their *Collections*. Dionysius Exiguus, and the other Latin collectors of canons, though deriving the Canons of Chalcedon from Greek sources, go no further than Canon xxvii. Nay more, in the ancient Greek MSS. of the council, the canon is not found;[298] from all which we may see how much credit is due to the bold assertions which have been put forward upon the subject. So far did the canon lose all force of law when rejected and annulled by Leo I., that during the controversy of Acacius, that ambitious prelate did not dare to appeal to it in defence of his unlawful usurpations.[299] The pseudo-synod in Trullo (A.D. 691), assembled by the authority of the Patriarch Callinicus, strove, in the Canon xxxvi., to revive the decree of Chalcedon.[300] But the Trullan Canons were never recognised by the Universal Church, and that pseudo-synod, stained with Monothelism, was reprobated in every part of the Catholic world.[301] If, in after times, the Bishops of Constantinople, puffed up with pride and ambition, carried their pretensions to greater lengths, and extended their influence and jurisdiction over the

[297] *Epist. Marciani Imp. ad Leonem Papam*, inter Epist. S. Leonis, epist. cx. (l. c., p. 1183).

[298] *Annot. ad Can.* xxviii. *Conc. Chalced.* (Labbe, t. iv., p. 1691).

[299] Marchetti: *Del Concilio di Sardica*, pt. iii., n. 73, p. 311, seq. Romæ, 1789.

[300] *Canones Ecclesiæ cum Comm. Th. Balsamonis*, Syn. vi. in Trullo, p. 401. Lut., Par., 1620.

[301] Labbe, t. viii., p. 37, seq.

metropolitans and bishops of the provinces bordering upon their diocese, it was by a usurpation which derived both shelter and support from the authority of many of the Byzantine Emperors, who were the sources of so much trouble in the Church of Christ.[302] But the Canon of Chalcedon, faithfully as it expressed the ambitious spirit of the clergy of Constantinople,[303] was never enforced as a law before the time of the schismatic Photius. We must not then wonder that it is found in the collections of Balsamon and Zonaras, two adherents of the schism,[304] or "That it obtains up to this day," as Dr. Overbeck tells us, "its place in the Canon Law of the Eastern Church." It is true, as the same writer adds, that it is inserted in the Canon Law not only of the Eastern Communion, but also of the Papal Church. It certainly was not so inserted before the year 1215, at which date the City of Constantinople, being occupied by the Franks and a Latin Patriarch placed in that see, the Fourth Council of Lateran, sanctioned in its Fifth Canon the honorary precedence of that Patriarch over those of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem.[305] Up to that time the Popes had firmly withstood the Canon xxviii. of Chalcedon, partly because, without any sufficient

[302] Codex Justin: l. i., tit. ii., *De Sacr. Ecclesiis*, n. xvi. (In Corpore Juris Civ., t. ii., pp. 19, 20. Edit. Herrmanni. Lipsiæ, 1865); Nov. cxxxi., *De Eccl. Can. et Privil.*, c. ii. (Op. cit., t. iii., p. 593).

[303] See *Epist. Anatolii ad Leonem P.*, inter Epist. S. Leonis, epist. cxxxiii., c. iv. (l. c., p. 1263).

[304] Theod. Balsamon, and other schismatics, went so far as to take the particle μετὰ (after) of the canon to mean inferiority of time, not of honour due to the Patriarch of Constantinople after the Pope. The error here committed was so patent as to provoke a censure from Zonaras himself.—See Allatius, *De Eccl. Orient. et Occident. perpetua Consensione*, l. i., c. xvii., n. 5, p. 253, seq. Coloniæ, 1648.

[305] *Conc. Lat.* iv., can. v. (Labbe, t. xiii., p. 938).

reason, it infringed the decrees of Nicæa, but principally because they well knew the unbridled ambition of the Byzantine Patriarch and clergy, and the fatal results which could not fail to be the consequence of their conduct. Their fears were justified by the incessant encroachments and impudent usurpations of the see of Constantinople, which continued without intermission until the time of the entire separation of that see from the centre of unity. The ambition of the Patriarch passed all bounds; he forced into subjection bishops and metropolitans who had been declared independent by œcumenical councils; he domineered over the Oriental Patriarchs, and usurped the vainglorious title of œcumenical. One prerogative alone remained unassailed, and that was the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff. Despite these usurpations, as we shall see more clearly in the next section, the Byzantine Church ever acknowledged the Papal supremacy—not merely by the use of expressions of devotion and affection, as Dr. Overbeck and Protestants would have men believe, but by evident marks of a dutiful submission. This church dared not arrogate to itself a divine authority built on the rock of Peter; disdaining, at length, to be held back in its ambitious course by any bonds of piety, however sacred, it refused to render obedience to the Apostolic See, but it had no thought of transferring to Constantinople the universal authority which, by Christ's appointment, was exercised at Rome. The schism of Photius and Michael Cerularius, though the fruit of an exorbitant ambition, succeeded, nevertheless, in carrying along with it the whole Oriental Church; for the prelates of the East, bishops, metropolitans, and Patriarchs, had long been slaves, bound in the fetters of the grasping Byzantine see. But God cast down this idol of pride and ambition, and the church which claimed to be independent of the successor

of St. Peter was delivered up to the despotism of the Sultan. We commend this page of history to the careful study of all who wish to understand the true purport, and to appreciate the real consequences, of the Eastern schism.

IX. Before leaving this question, we may notice an argument adduced by Dr. Pusey. In the list of alleged Papal contradictions which he brings forward as inextricable difficulties to Catholics,[306] he confronts together two passages taken from epistles of Leo I. and Adrian II. on the Canon xxviii. of Chalcedon. "The first," says the author, "rejects the Twenty-eighth Canon, which placed Constantinople in the second rank to Rome, as being opposed to the rules of the sacred canons established at Nicæa. On the contrary, Pope Adrian says,[307] 'He (the Patriarch of Constantinople) never could have ranked second, save for the authority of our holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, as is plain to all,' which rank Constantinople took and held on the authority of the canon from the time of the council itself."[308] Upon this we make the following remarks: First, Dr. Pusey we think does not translate Adrian's words with exactness, as will appear from the original, given below in the note. Again, Pope Adrian, writing to Constantine the Emperor of the East, expresses his surprise that in the Imperial Acts the Patriarch Tarasius was termed "universal;" and he further asks, as his name is with difficulty ranked second, through the authority of the Apostolic See, how is it that he is called universal, by which term he would be raised

[306] *Eirenicon*, p. 318.

[307] Adrian's words are as follows: "In secundo ordine, si non per nostræ sanctæ Catholicæ et Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ auctoritatem (sicut in omnibus patet) nunquam valuit nomen habere."—*In Conc. Nic.* ii., act. ii. (Labbe, t. viii., p. 764).

[308] *Eirenicon*, p. 315.

above the Roman See itself? To know what is meant by the Byzantine Patriarch's name being ranked second, through the authority of the Apostolic See, we must read the proceedings of the first session of the Synod of Chalcedon, and the beginning of the Twenty-fifth Epistle in the first book of St. Gregory's letters. In the session alluded to, Anatolius took the first place after the legates of the Pope, as appears from the list of the bishops assembled in the council. The Papal legates, far from objecting to this, themselves declared that it was according to the rules of the Church; nay, they censured Dioscorus for having reduced Flavian to the fifth place in the Latrocinium of Ephesus. "We," said Paschasinus, one of the legates of Pope Leo, "according to the will of God, ranked first Bishop Anatolius, and they of Ephesus placed Blessed Flavian the fifth." Then Diogenes, Bishop of Cyzicus, remarked: "That is because you know the rules of the Church."[309] Now the legates who in the first session followed the canons of the Church in ranking Anatolius first after themselves as the Pope's representatives, in the sixteenth session opposed the Twenty-eighth Canon, protested against it, and declared it contrary to the established law. But in acting thus they no way contradicted themselves, nor did Pope Leo cast the least censure upon their conduct. Again, Pope Gregory gave no sanction whatever to the Twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon, although in addressing the above-quoted epistle to the three Patriarchs of Constantinople, of Alexandria, and of Antioch, he assigns the first place to the Byzantine Patriarch.[310] From this we gather that there is no contradiction whatever between rejecting the Twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon, and asserting that through the

[309] *Conc. Chalced*, act. i. (Labbe, t. iv., p. 889).
[310] Op., t. c., p. 507.

authority of the Apostolic See, the first rank after Rome had been conferred upon the Patriarch of Constantinople. Long before the Council of Chalcedon, and as far back as the time of Theodosius I., the Roman See had consented that the Bishop of Constantinople, on account of the majesty of the imperial capital, of the special protection received by him from the Emperors, and of his influence over the whole Eastern Church, should be named as second in dignity in all official acts, and that in the great assemblies of bishops he should hold the next place to the Pope, or the Papal legates. But a broad distinction was always made between that kind of honour granted freely to the Byzantine Bishops, and the prerogatives which the Council of Chalcedon would have given to that prelate. The former honour could have no influence upon the canonical arrangements of bishops and Patriarchs in the Eastern Church. But the Canon of Chalcedon, in the hands of an ambitious prelate, surrounded by a yet more ambitious clergy, would have given a master to all the bishops and Patriarchs of the East, and disturbed the ecclesiastical economy of the whole Church. The letters, therefore, of Leo and Adrian are in perfect accord; no trace can be found of want of harmony between them. In the same way the rest of the imaginary Papal contradictions, whereof so long a list has been brought together, vanish on examination, as we have already seen in part, and shall further see in the course of the present and a future volume. Finally, the parenthetic expression found at the end of the above-quoted extract, is historically incorrect, for Constantinople enjoyed the rank mentioned as belonging to it in Adrian's letter, before the time of the Council of Chalcedon, and not in pursuance of the Twenty-eighth Canon.

As we have said, and as we shall see again in the

next section, the Byzantine Bishops owed the rank which they held—in opposition to the Apostolic See—to illegal grants of monarchs of the Lower Empire, and to usurpations of their own.

SECTION V.

THE SAME INQUIRY CONTINUED DOWN TO THE SEPARATION OF THE GREEK FROM THE LATIN CHURCH—CONVERSION OF RUSSIA.

I. The history of the Eastern Church affords proofs so numerous in favour of the divine supremacy of the Pope, that to give each one in detail would be to write the whole history afresh. A summary statement of a few of them is all that we are able to give in the present section. Pope Simplicius (468—483), who, after no long interval, succeeded to the Chair of St. Leo, exerted the full extent of his supreme power against the usurpations of the heretics who were at that time disturbing the Churches of Alexandria and Antioch. His letters, addressed to the Emperors Basiliscus and Zeno, to the Patriarch Acacius, and to the clergy of Constantinople,[311] clearly exhibit him as convinced of his supreme authority. Thus, he describes himself as speaking with the voice of the Apostle Peter.[312] He declares that to

[311] S. Simplicius: *Epist.* iv.—vii. (Labbe, t. v., pp. 96, 99, 101).

[312] "Quo magis B. Petri Apostoli voce qualiscumque sedis ejus minister obtestor."—*Epist.* iv., cit. (l. c., p. 99).

teach the true doctrine laid down by the Apostles belongs to him as supreme pastor of the whole Church, to whom all the flock is committed, and who holds the inheritance of the promises of Christ.[313] In accordance with this principle, he adopts a tone of supreme authority, and enforces on the Emperors themselves the observance of their duty.[314] In spite of this language and conduct of the Pope, no protest, no objection of any kind was raised against his interference in the affairs of the Oriental Church. On the contrary, the tyrannical determination of the Emperor Basiliscus succumbed to the energetic efforts of St. Simplicius;[315] the Emperor Zeno yielded to the advice of the same Pontiff,[316] and in compliance with it begged of him a dispensation from a certain disciplinary Canon of Nicæa, regarding the election and consecration of the Patriarch of Antioch.[317] Finally, Acacius himself, in solemn form, acknowledged that the Pope was entrusted with the care of all the Churches.[318]

II. It is foreign to our present purpose to give a detailed account of the Acacian controversy under Pope Felix III., the successor of Simplicius (483—492), though it would furnish irresistible evidence of the

[313] L. c., pp. 97—99.

[314] *Ibid.*, *Epist.* v.—viii. (l. c., pp. 99—104).

[315] "Basiliscus tyrannus et hæreticus scriptis Apostolicæ Sedis vehementer infractus est et a plurimis revocatus excessibus."—*In Epist.* xiii. *S. Gelasii Papæ* (Labbe, t. v., p. 332).

[316] Evagrius: *Hist.*, l. iii., c. viii. Edit. Valesii, p. 309. Codex Justin: l. i., tit. ii., leg. xvi., pt. ii., p. 19. Edit. Herrmanni, Lipsiæ, 1865. *Breviculus Hist. Eccl.*, apud Labbe, t. v., p. 144; et *Epist.* x. *S. Simplicii, ad Zenonem* (Labbe, l. c., p. 106).

[317] See *Epist.* xiv., xv., S. Simplicii (Labbe, l. c., pp. 110-11).

[318] *Epist. Acacii ad Simpl. Papam* (Labbe, l. c., p. 104). "Sollicitudinem omnium Ecclesiarum secundum Apostolum circumferentes nos indesinenter hortamini," &c.

divinely-instituted supremacy of the Popes. We see throughout the controversy between Pope Felix III. on the one side, and the Emperor Zeno and the Patriarch Acacius on the other, that neither the Emperor nor the Patriarch makes the least protest against the extensive power claimed by the Pope over the Patriarch of Constantinople. No doubt of his jurisdiction over the Oriental Church is intimated by them ; they never arrogate to themselves what we have seen claimed on behalf of the Anglican communion,[319] "that they had a right to regulate the affairs of their own church by and for themselves, independently of the Bishop of Rome." Although Felix III., as became the true vicar of the love of Christ, in the earlier stages of the controversy, used with them the language of a tender father anxious for the salvation of his children,[320] he did not forget that he had received from God the office of their superior in spiritual matters, and of judge of their usurpations. Measures of kindness and conciliation were at length exhausted, and when the Church of Alexandria had been brought to the verge of utter ruin through the protection afforded by Acacius to the heretical usurper of that see, Pope Felix deemed that the time had come for him to perform the duty of a supreme judge. Thereupon he summoned the Patriarch of Constantinople to present himself before the Apostolic See to give an account of his conduct, and to receive his sentence.[321] At the same time, under sanction of the divine vengeance, he commanded the Emperor Zeno to put an end to the evils of the Church of Alexandria, and to oblige Acacius to submit obedi-

[319] Pusey : *Vindication of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 139.

[320] St. Felix III. : *Epist.* i., ii. (Labbe, t. v., pp. 143, 148).

[321] *Libellus citationis ad Acacium* (Labbe, l. c., p. 217).

ently to the summons of the Roman See.[322] Neither the Emperor nor the Patriarch raised any protest against the jurisdiction exercised by the Pope over the latter. Acacius, it is true, did not obey the orders of the Pope, who on this account, and in virtue of his supreme power, pronounced against the rebel a solemn sentence of excommunication, and deposition from all ecclesiastical pre-eminence. "Acknowledge," says the Pontiff in his letter, "acknowledge that you have been separated from the Catholic communion, and from the number of the faithful, that the name and the office of the priesthood has been taken away from you; that you are condemned by the judgment of the Holy Ghost, and by the authority of the Apostolic See; that you shall never be freed from the bonds of the anathema.—I, Cæcilius Felix, Bishop of the holy Catholic Church of Rome, have signed this sentence."[323] At the same time he forbade the clergy and people of Constantinople to communicate with the deposed Patriarch,[324] and threatened with excommunication all who should attempt to act against his orders.[325] These facts imply nothing short of a divine supreme authority exercised in its fulness by the Pope, and as fully acknowledged by the Oriental Church.

[322] *Libellus Felicis III. ad Zenonem Imp.* (Labbe, l. c., p. 218). "Divino judicio suggerimus . . . ut idem frater et coepiscopus meus Acacius . . . ad hæc quæ de se pervidet intimari apud Beatissimum Petrum Apostolum diluere obedienter procuret, nec ullo modo existimet differendum."

[323] St. Felix III.: *Epist.* vi., *ad Acacium* (Labbe, l. c., p. 169). *Breviculus Hist. Eutych. seu de nomine Acacii* (Labbe, l. c., p. 177). Liberatus: *Brev. Hist.*, c. xviii. (Gallandi, Bibl., t. xii., p. 150). Theophanes: *Chron. ad* A.D. 480, vol. i. Edit. Bonnæ, p. 205, &c.

[324] St. Felix III.: *Epist.* x., *ad Clerum et Plebem Constantinop.* (Labbe, l. c., p. 178, seq.).

[325] *Edictum* S. Felicis III. (Labbe, l. c., p. 177).

III. We must be brief, and we therefore pass over the glorious Pontificates of Gelasius (492—496) and Anastasius II. (496—498); but we cannot omit those of Symmachus (498—514), and Hormisdas (514—523), under whom the whole Oriental Church sent to the Roman Pontiff a clear and solemn declaration in acknowledgment of the divine supremacy of the Pope.[326] Symmachus, faithful to the duties of his ministry, failed not to notice the trials endured by the Oriental Church under the tyrannical yoke of the Emperor Anastasius. He left no means untried in his attempt to bring it back to the paths of order and grace. Anastasius remained obdurate in his impiety, but the whole episcopate and the lower clergy of the East rendered the most solemn homage to the Catholic cause and to the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff. They addressed a letter to him openly confessing that Christ Himself had entrusted to his Holiness the Chair of St. Peter;[327] that he (Symmachus) had been taught by the Prince of the Apostles to feed the sheep committed to his care throughout the habitable world;[328] that to him was the power given, not of binding only, but also of loosing.[329] They declared that next to God they looked to him, in order to receive from him light and direction;[330] they besought him, therefore, to enlighten

[326] The title of that letter is, *Ecclesia Orientalis ad Symmachum Episcopum Romanum* (Labbe, t. v., pp. 433—38).

[327] "Sicut docuit gloriosorum Apostolorum Princeps, cujus cathedram beatitudini tuæ credidit Christus optimus Pastor," &c. (l. c., p. 434).

[328] "Non enim ignoras ejus ingenium qui quotidie a sacro doctore tuo Petro doceris oves Christi per totum habitabilem mundum creditas tibi pascere non vi, sed sponte coactas" (l. c.).

[329] "Non in ligando tantum potestas est tibi tradita sed in solvendo quoque diu vinctos ad imitationem magistri" (l. c.).

[330] "Omnes post Deum tuæ lumen visitationis et assumptionis opperimur" (l. c., p. 436).

them with the light of faith, with the light of his spiritual wisdom;[331] and in order to move his paternal heart, they laid open to him the fatal wounds of the Oriental Church, that being himself a good physician, and as vicar of the Divine Physician, he might heal them.[332] Nor did the 168 clerics and archimandrites, in the *Relation* addressed by them to Hormisdas, manifest any discrepancy of doctrine from that of the above letter. In express terms they recognise Hormisdas as the most holy and blessed Patriarch of the whole world, who holds the See of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles.[333] They apply to him as the prince of pastors, the doctor and physician of souls, the head of all.[334] On this account they lay before him the evils and sufferings of the Eastern Church, and denounce the wolves who were ravaging it, in order that by the power of his own authority he might expel them from the midst of the sheep.[335] We cannot then wonder that the whole of the East submitted to the hard conditions imposed by Hormisdas as the terms of the long-desired reconciliation;[336] nor that all the bishops of that

[331] "Illuminate Orientem rectæ fidei lumine" (l. c.). "Illuminate nos spiritualis scientiæ vestræ lumine" (l. c., p. 437).

[332] "Quia non est ulcus, aut macula, aut plaga tumens, sed totum ulcus est a pedibus usque ad caput . . . vos jam boni medici et illius veri medici, vel bonorum discipulorum ejus certissimi plantatores festinate ad curam," &c. (l. c., p. 436).

[333] *Relatio Archimandritarum, &c., ad Hormisdam Papam* (Labbe, l. c., p. 598). "Sanctissimo et Beatissimo universi orbis terræ Patriarchæ Hormisdæ continenti Sedem Principis Apostolorum Petri."

[334] "Christus Deus noster principem pastorum et doctorem et medicum animarum constituit vos," &c. (l. c., p. 598).

[335] "Ut auctoritatis baculo eos (lupos) expellat de medio ovium," &c. (l. c.).

[336] See the *Libellus of the Legates of the Popes* (Apud Labbe, l. c., p. 612, seq.).

church,[337] with their Patriarchs and their Emperor, signed the formula of union amidst shouts and tears of universal joy.[338] In that solemn exposition of faith they profess to believe the divine supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, whose faith is the faith of Peter, as to Peter belongs the chair of doctrine on which he sits.[339] They therefore promise to follow the Apostolic See in all things, and to teach whatever it defines, for in it is the solid foundation of the Christian religion.[340] Hence they conclude that those who are not with the Catholic Church—that is, who do not agree in all things with the Apostolic See—should not be named in the sacred mysteries.[341] This precious document of the faith of the East, signed by all the Patriarchs, and accepted, of course, by the whole Western Church, has a weight of authority not less than that of a definition of faith pronounced by an œcumenical council. Now, according to the principles of the High Church school in England,

[337] Rusticus—who wrote under Justinian, the successor of Justin—says that the formulary of Hormisdas was signed by 2,500 priests (*sacerdotes*, bishops) of the Eastern Church.—*Disputatio contra Acephalos* (Gallandi, Bibl., t. xii., p. 75).

[338] *Suggestio* ii. *et* iii. *Leg. Hormisdæ* (Labbe, l. c., pp. 620-21). *Suggestio Germani* (l. c., p. 625).

[339] "Non potest D. N. J. C. prætermitti sententia dicentis: 'Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam.' Hæc quæ dicta sunt rerum probantur effectibus: quia in Sede Apostolica inviolabilis semper Catholica custoditur religio."—*Exemplum libelli Joannis Episc. Constant. ad Hormisdam Papam* (Labbe, l. c., p. 622).

[340] "Quamobrem, sicut prædiximus, sequentes in omnibus Sedem Apostolicam et prædicamus omnia quæ ab ipsa decreta sunt . . . in qua est integra Christianæ religionis et perfecta soliditas" (l. c.).

[341] "Promittentes in sequenti tempore sequestratos a communione Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, idest in omnibus non consentientes Sedi Apostolicæ, eorum nomina inter sacra non recitanda mysteria" (l. c.).

when the three branches of the Church—that is, the Roman, the Greek, and the Anglican—agree in a dogmatic definition of any doctrine, this doctrine must be regarded as a matter of faith. They would find it difficult to prove that in the time of Pope Hormisdas there was the least disagreement in any of the so-called branches of the Church with regard to the divine supremacy of the Roman Bishop.

IV. But the signature of this solemn act under Hormisdas failed to put an end to the troubles of the Oriental Church. As soon as the patronage of the Empress Theodora had seated Anthimus in the Patriarchal chair of Constantinople, he cast off all disguise, and showed himself an open Eutychian. The Church of Constantinople was again in distress, again needed assistance to rid itself of the heretical Patriarch. Whither then did it turn its eyes; to whom did it look for aid in its troubles? It turned to Rome, to Pope Agapitus. Upwards of ninety archimandrites of Constantinople poured forth their supplication to the Roman Pontiff in a letter addressed, "To the most holy and blessed Agapitus, Archbishop of ancient Rome and universal Patriarch."[342] The bishops and clergy of the province also wrote, "To our lord, the most holy Father of Fathers, Agapitus, Archbishop of Rome."[343] Both the archimandrites and the bishops urged the Pontiff to condemn and depose the Patriarch Anthimus. Agapitus, therefore, being at the time in Constantinople, in virtue of his supreme power divinely bestowed, stripped the heretic Anthimus of all the prerogatives of the priesthood, and appointed the orthodox Mennas as his suc-

[342] *Libellus Monachorum Agapito Papæ oblatus*, in Actis Conc. Constan., act. i. (Labbe, pp. 983—1000).

[343] *Libellus Episcoporum Orientalium oblatus Agapito*, l. c. (Labbe, t. v., pp. 1000—1010).

cessor. Theophanes does not hesitate to record the fact in these terms;[344] and the Council of Constantinople itself, held under the new Patriarch, bears convincing testimony to it.[345] Now, who does not see in the conduct of Agapitus that of a superior divinely appointed to redress the wrongs of Christ's Church, to whom bishops and Patriarchs were bound to submit? For, remark, we have the authority of the General Council itself, assembled under Mennas. We read in the Acts of the Council, that Anthimus, in order to avoid the sentence of deposition, sent to the Emperor a dutiful profession of faith, promising, "That he would do whatever the Pontiff of the great Apostolic See should decree;" and he wrote to all the holy Patriarchs, "That he would in all things follow the Apostolic See"[346]—submission to the Roman See being treated as an unequivocal mark of orthodoxy. Moreover, Mennas himself delivered, before the assembled synod, the subjoined profession of faith: "We follow and obey the Apostolic See, holding communion with those who communicate with it, and condemning others, whom it condemns."[347] The professsion of faith presented to Pope Agapitus by the Emperor Justinian was conceived in the same terms: "Following in all things the Apostolic See, we set forth what has been ordained by it, and we profess that these things shall be kept without fail, and we will order

[344] Theophanes: *Chronographia ad* A.D. 529, vol. i. Edit. Bonnæ, p. 337. Agapitus himself speaks of it in his letter addressed to the Patriarch of Antioch (Labbe, t. v., pp. 1010—1012).

[345] *Sententia Synodi contra Anthimum* (Labbe, t. v., p. 1052). *Sententia Mennæ contra eundem* (l. c., p. 1056).

[346] *Sententia Synodi contra Anthimum* (Labbe, l. c.).

[347] *Sententia Mennæ contra Anthimum* (l. c., p. 1057). ἡμεῖς γὰρ . . . τῷ Ἀποστολικῷ θρόνῳ ἑξακολουθοῦμεν τε, καὶ πειθόμεθα, καὶ τοὺς κοινωνικοὺς αὐτοῦ, κοινωνικοὺς ἔχομεν, καὶ τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καταχριθέντας, καὶ ἡμεῖς καταχρίνομεν.

that all bishops shall do according to the tenor of that formulary—the Patriarchs to your Holiness, and the metropolitans to the Patriarchs, the rest to their own metropolitans; that in all things our holy Catholic Church may have its proper solidity."[348] Pope Vigilius (537—555), likewise, supplies us with another proof of supreme authority over the Oriental Church. He was aware that Theodorus, Bishop of Cæsarea, confident in the imperial patronage enjoyed by him despite his scandalous usurpations and excesses, had grown obstinate in his errors. Yet he hesitated not to assemble several bishops in the Church of St. Peter at Constantinople, and to pronounce in their presence a solemn sentence of excommunication and deposition against that impudent usurper of ecclesiastical rights.[349] At the same time he anathematised the Patriarch Mennas, and all the bishops who had favoured or approved his excesses.[350] This sentence of the supreme Pastor did not fail of effect. Justinian withdrew the orders which he had given in reference to the Three Chapters, and in

[348] *Secunda formula Fidei a Justiniano oblata Agapito Papæ* (Labbe, t. v., p. 948).

[349] The words of the condemnation are as follows:—"Ex persona et auctoritate B. Petri Apostoli . . . hac Theodorum Cæsareæ Cappadociae civitatis quondam episcopum, sententiæ promulgatione, tam sacerdotali honore et communione Catholica quam omni officio episcopali seu potestate spoliatum esse decernimus" (Labbe, l. c., p. 1316).

[350] "Teque Mennam Constantinopolitanæ civitatis episcopum, qui non dissimili culpa constringeris, cum omnibus metropolitanis et micropolitanis episcopis ad tuam diœcesim pertinentibus, sed ad tuos Orientales, vel diversarum provinciarum majorum minorumque civitatum episcopos, qui his excessibus pro quibus Theodorum Cæsareæ Cappadociæ quondam episcopum condemnavimus, præbuistis assensum, humaniore sententia, pro Dei consideratione tamdiu a sacra communione suspendimus, donec unusquisque vestrum errorem suæ prævaricationis agnoscens, culpam apud nos propriam competenti satisfactione diluerit" (l. c.).

accordance with the will of the Pope,[351] referred the question to the General Council. Theodorus and Mennas, with many others of the bishops, who had incurred Papal anathema, humbled themselves at the feet of the successor of St. Peter, submitted to his decrees, and implored from him pardon and penance for their faults.[352] These facts furnish another incontrovertible proof that the Oriental Church fully recognised the divine supremacy of the Pope.

V. The following instances show that St. Gregory the Great exercised no less authority than his predecessors:—(1.) Athanasius, a priest of Isauria, had been condemned for heresy by the Patriarch of Constantinople. He appeals to Pope Gregory, who, after having examined the process and the documents sent to him by the Byzantine Patriarch, pronounces his definitive sentence in favour of Athanasius, and notifies it to the Patriarch. His words are quoted in the note, and none could more strongly express the conviction of his supreme authority.[353] And still the Eastern Church in no wise objected to his jurisdiction. (2.) Again, a priest of Chalcedon had been condemned as a heretic by the same Patriarch. Pope Gregory, appealed to by the condemned priest, cancelled the process in the Second Roman Synod, declared him innocent, and openly

[351] See Baronius' *Annales* A.D. 552, n. 16, p. 468, t. vii. Edit. Lugd.

[352] *Constitutum Vigilii Papæ* (Labbe, l. c., p. 1318).

[353] "Ab omni te hæreticæ perversitatis macula juxta professionem tuam liberam esse decernimus atque Catholicum et sinceræ fidei in omnibus professorem atque sequacem Christi Jesu salvatoris gratia claruisse pronuntiamus. . . . De hoc quoque et dilectissimo fratri nostro Constantinopolitanæ civitatis antistiti, qui in supra dicti Sancti Joannis loco ordinatus est, nostra volumus scripta transmittere."—*Epist.*, l. v., epist. lxvi., *ad Athanasium presbyt.* (Op., t. ii., p. 803. Edit. Maur).

censured his judges as guilty of injustice.[354] He intimated that sentence to the Patriarch John in the most authoritative terms,[355] and in the same manner he wrote to the Emperor Maurice, and to Theotistus his brother-in-law, in order to secure protection to the priest John against the unjust violence of his enemies.[356] Now, if Gregory I. was no more than equal in jurisdiction to the Patriarch of Constantinople, how could the proud spirit of that Patriarch, who had been so stubborn in defending the new title of *Universal*, endure silently the interference of the Pope with his judgment, and the authoritative quashing of his sentence? If it be true, as Bingham declares, that "From the judgment of a Patriarch there lies no appeal,"[357] how could Pope Gregory, like his predecessors, exercise such an appellate jurisdiction, save in virtue of a supremacy fully recognised throughout the whole Eastern Church? (3.) A third proof of the supreme jurisdiction exercised by St. Gregory over the Patriarch of Constantinople is afforded in the sentence passed by him on the monks of Isauria condemned as heretics in the Court of the Byzantine Patriarch. Pope Gregory reversed that sentence, and acquitted the monks.[358] (4.) But the conduct of Pope Gregory towards John, Patriarch of Constantinople, casts the fullest light on the matter, and admits of no reply whatever; for upon hearing that the

[354] *Conc. Rom.* ii. (Labbe, t. vi., p. 135). S. Gregorius: *Epist.*, l. v., epist. xv., *ad Joan. Episc. Constant.*, p. 803.

[355] S. Gregorius (l. c., p. 804): "Eapropter eorumdem judicum reprobantes sententiam nostra cum definitione Catholicum et ab omni hæretico crimine liberum esse, Christi Dei Redemptoris nostri gratia revelante denuntiamus."

[356] S. Gregorius: *Epist.*, l. v., epist. xvi., xvii. (l. c., pp. 804-5).

[357] Bingham: *Christian Antiquities*, bk. ii., c. xvii., sec. xiv., vol. 1, p. 238. London.

[358] S. Gregorius: *Epist.*, l. vii., epist. xxxiv., *ad Eulogium Episc. Alex.* (l. c., p. 882).

Patriarch was obstinate in claiming the title of universal bishop, he sent instructions to Sabinian, his *Apocrisiarius* in Constantinople, to act with the fullest authority in restraining that ambitious prelate.[359] He wrote to the Patriarch representing himself as under the obligation of correcting any disorder which might arise in the Universal Church; he said that, acccording to the example of the meekness of Christ, he had repeatedly used the mildest forms of admonition and exhortation; that should these efforts be treated with contempt, he should be forced to make use of the authority of the Church, for when a dangerous wound cannot be healed by gentle handling, we must have recourse to the knife.[360] Now, what bishop in the Church ever had the power *resecandi vulnera*, using the knife to the wounds of another bishop his equal? Where are the canons which authorise even a metropolitan to act thus towards his suffragans? Had a Patriarch the authority to inflict a sentence of condemnation and deposition upon another Patriarch? Unquestionably no Patriarch was ever allowed to act thus against the Western Patriarch, and Dioscorus, who attempted it, was excommunicated and deposed ex-

[359] S. Gregorius: *Epist.*, l. v., epist. xix. (l. c., p. 747). "In hac causa quidquid agendum est cum summa auctoritate agat."

[360] S. Gregorius: *Epist.*, l. v., epist. xviii. *ad Joan. Episc. Const.* (l. c., p. 742). "Si emendare nolles eum (Sabinianum Apocrisarium), Missarum solemnia cum fraternitate vestra celebrare prohibui, ut sanctitatem vestram prius sub quadam verecundiæ reverentia pulsarem: quatenus si emendari nefandus et profanus tumor verecunde non posset, tunc ad ea debuisset, quæ sunt districta atque canonica perveniri. Et quia resecanda vulnera prius leni manu palpanda sunt: rogo, deprecor et quanta possum dulcedine exposco," &c. *Ibid.*, epist. cit. (l. c., p. 746): "Ego itaque per Responsales meos semel et bis verbis humilibus hoc quod in tota Ecclesia peccatur corripere studui: nunc per me ipsum scribo. Quidquid facere humiliter debui non omisi. Sed si in mea correptione despicior, restat ut Ecclesiam debeam adhibere."

pressly on that very account in the Council of Chalcedon.[361] On the other hand, the Roman Patriarch exercised this supreme power over all other Patriarchs of the East, each and all of whom submitted to his authority; none of them raised the least objection to his supreme jurisdiction. The divine supremacy alone can furnish the explanation of these facts. But in order better to understand the conduct of Pope Gregory towards John, Patriarch of Constantinople, and, consequently, the nature of the authority exercised, we must recall to mind the *Statutes* sanctioned by Pope Pelagius, from which his successor, St. Gregory, declared that he would never depart.[362] These are contained in a letter addressed by the Pontiff to the bishops of the Eastern Church.[363] In this letter, Pelagius asserts the divine supremacy and authority of the Apostolic See; he speaks of the act of John in calling a synod without the authority of that See as presumptuous, and annuls all the decrees of that synod relating to the title of *œcumenical bishop*, which the Byzantine Patriarch had usurped.[364] St. Gregory, confiding in the same Apostolic

[361] *Conc. Chalcedon*, act. v. (Labbe, t. iv., p. 1448). διὰ τὴν πίστιν οὐ καθηρέθη Διόσκορος, ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ δὴ ἀκοινωνησίαν ἐποίησε τῷ κυρίῳ Λέοντι τῷ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ.

[362] S. Gregorius: *Epist.*, l. ix., epist. lxviii. (l. c., p. 984). "Cujus (Pelagii) nos rectitudinis zelo per omnia inhærentes statuta ipsius sine refragatione, Deo protegente, servamus, quia dignum est ut rectam decessoris sui viam gressibus inoffensis incedat, quem de eodem loco ad reddendam rationem æterni judicis tribunal expectat."

[363] Pelagius II.: *Epist.* vii. (Labbe, t. vi., p. 633). This epistle belongs to the Isidorian collection, and is, therefore, probably interpolated. Nevertheless, we quote that part only to which allusion is made in the genuine letter of St. Gregory.

[364] Pelagius II.: *Epist.* vii. (Labbe, t. vi., p. 634). Penes S. Gregorium: Epist. cit. (l. c., p. 984). "Quod beatæ recordationis Pelagius decessor noster agnoscens omnia gesta ejusdem Synodi,

authority, and supported by the example of all his predecessors in St. Peter's Chair, followed in the footsteps of Pelagius. His conduct was that which became the head of the Church divinely appointed by Christ, and the Greeks, by submitting to his orders, acknowledged his authority over the whole Church.

VI. We should never make an end were we to enumerate all the instances in which the Eastern Churches manifest their recognition of the Papal prerogative. At the end of the Monothelite controversy, evidences in favour of this recognition are of frequent occurrence. Stephen, Bishop of Dora, had been educated in the Catholic principles of Sophronius, who alone, of all the Patriarchs of the East, during this period, remained firm in fidelity to the revealed doctrine of the Incarnation. Stephen had been one of the earliest members of the synod held at Jerusalem against the new heresy; being sent to Rome by Sophronius, he presented to Pope Martin, in the Lateran Council (A.D. 649) a *Libellus* in which he bore the most luminous testimony to the Pope's supremacy. "Who shall give us," he wrote, "the wings of a dove, that we may fly and lay down our distress before your supreme See, the ruler and governor of all, that the wound may be entirely healed?" He continues to show that Martin's authority was the authority of St. Peter, appointed to feed the whole flock of Christ. Finally, referring to the mission entrusted to him by Sophronius, he reported that the holy Patriarch had addressed him as follows: "Go thou with all speed from one end of the earth to the other, till thou come to the Apostolic See, where the founda-

præter illa quæ illic de causa venerandæ memoriæ Gregorii Episcopi Antiocheni sunt habita, valida omnino districtione cassavit districtissima illum increpatione corripiens, ut se a novo et a temerario superstitionis nomine cohiberet."

tions of the true faith are laid."[365] In the same Lateran Council, another testimony to the divine supremacy of the Roman See may be found which came from a different Eastern province. Sergius, Metropolitan of Cyprus, wrote to "The most holy and blessed and godly lord the Lord Theodorus, Father of Fathers, Archbishop, and Universal Pope. Christ our Lord," he proceeds, "has established the Apostolic See, oh sacred head, as a divinely fixed and immovable basis, at which the faith is learnt in its brightness. For as the divine Word truly pronounced, 'Thou art Peter, and on thy foundation the pillars of the Church are placed.' To thee has He committed the keys of heaven, and given the charge of binding and loosing. Thou art appointed the destroyer of profane heresy, the leader and doctor of the orthodox and immaculate faith."[366] St. Maximus, that illustrious Doctor of the seventh century, raised up by God to contend against the Monothelites, also bears clear testimony to the supremacy of the Holy See as acknowledged in the Eastern Church. "Whosoever," he says, "anathematises those who condemn Pyrrhus, anathematises the See of Rome, that is to say, the Catholic Church."[367] And he goes on to say that this See is the centre and the exemplar of faith, communion with which is necessary to all who wish to belong to the Catholic Church. The Sixth General Council (A.D. 680) testifies to the same truth. In the prosphonetic letter addressed to the Emperor Constantine, the Fathers of that synod declare that the great Prince of the Apostles, in the person of Pope Agatho, his successor, struggled

[365] *Libellus Precum Stephani Dorensis.* In Conc. Later. I., secret. ii. (Labbe, t. vii., p. 105, seq.).

[366] *Libellus Sergii Cypri.* In Conc. Later. i., l. c. (Harduini, *Acta Concil.*, t. iii., pp. 728-29).

[367] *Diffloratio ex Epist. S. Maximi ad Petrum illustrem* (Op., t. ii. Edit. Migne, p. 144).

against error. They believe that Peter himself spake through Agatho.[368] The same assertion is repeated in the synodic letter addressed to the Pope: "To thee who art the first See, and the ruler of the Universal Church, we leave the office of deciding what course must be adopted, since thou art founded on the solid rock of faith." They add that they had willingly read the letters forwarded by Agatho to the Emperor,[369] and that they had acknowledged them as divinely written by the chief of the Apostles.[370]

VII. In the next General Council, being the Second of Nicæa (A.D. 787), a letter was read from Pope Adrian I. to Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, wherein the Pontiff states most plainly the divine authority of his supremacy. He writes as follows: "'The gates of hell shall not prevail against her.' And again, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church.' . . . Whose See was appointed the head of all the Churches of God, as holding supremacy over the whole world. Wherefore the blessed Apostle Peter, through the word of God feeding the Church, has retained, and will ever retain, the Princedom. . . . The Saviour of the world gave the Apostle Peter princedom and authority over the whole world; and through the same Apostle in whose place we, although unworthy, at present sit, the holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church has up to the present time held, and

[368] *Epist. Prosphonetica Concil.* vi. *ad Constantinum Imp.* (Labbe, t. vii., p. 1089.)

[369] *Epist. Agathonis Papæ ad Constantinum Imp.* (Labbe, l. c., p. 652, seq.).

[370] *Epist. Synodi Conc.* vi. *ad Agathonem Papam* (Labbe, t. vii., p. 1109.) Ὅθεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ὡς πρωτοθρόνῳ σοι τῆς οἰκουμενικῆς ἐκκλησίας τὸ πρακτέον παρατιθέμεθα, ἐπὶ τὴν στερεὰν πέτραν ἑστῶτι τῆς πίστεως . . . ἅπερ καὶ ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς κορυφαίας τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀκρότητος θεολογηθέντα γινώσκομεν.

will for ever hold, his princedom and authority. . . . It is the head of all the Churches of the world." Then the council, Tarasius himself being among them, having heard Adrian's letter, unanimously exclaimed, "We follow, accept, and admit, these letters."[371] The Patriarch Tarasius also, in a letter addressed to the Pope, fully acknowledged the divine supremacy of the Apostolic See.[372] The holy Nicephorus, his successor (A.D. 806), did not swerve from this guiding principle. Not only did he profess to follow the doctrine of the Roman Pontiff, who was divinely instructed, and was his Apostolic father and lord;[373] but he also expressly maintains the primacy of the Apostolic See, without the consent of which, as he maintains, no examination and sanction by a General Council would render it possible practically to enforce a doctrine in the Church.[374] About the same time, Theodorus Studites, who is still honoured among the greatest saints in the Greek Church, affords the most unequivocal testimony to the firm and universal persuasion of the East as to the question before us. He calls the Pope "most divine head of all heads;[375] chief

[371] Hadrianus I.: *Epist. ad Tarasium*, in act. ii. Conc. Nic. ii. (Labbe, t. viii., p. 772). *Ex collectione Anastasii Bibl.*, p. 764. The synod answered—ἐπόμεθα καὶ δεχόμεθα καὶ προσιέμεθα (L. c., p. 776).

[372] *Epist. Tarasii Patr. ad Hadrianum I.*, in act. viii. Conc. Nic. ii. (Labbe, t. viii, p. 1280).

[373] *Epist. S. Nicephori Patr. Constant. ad Leonem III. Papam* (Labbe, t. ix., p. 292, seq.).

[374] S. Nicephorus: *Apologeticus pro Sanctis Imaginibus* (Op. Edit. Migne, PP. Græc., t. c., p. 597). ὧν ἄνευ δόγμα κατὰ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν κινούμενον θεσμοῖς κανονικοῖς καὶ ἱερατικοῖς ἔθεσι νενομισμένον ἄνωθεν, τὴν δοκιμασίαν οὐ σχοίη, ἥ δέξαιτ' ἄν ποτε τὴν περαίωσιν, ὡς δὴ λαχόντων κατὰ τὴν ἱερωσύνην ἐξάρχειν, καὶ τῶν κορυφαίων ἐν ἀποστόλοις ἐγκεχειρισμένων τὸ ἀξίωμα.

[375] S. Theodorus Stud.: *Epist.*, l. i., epist. xxxiii., *ad Leonem III.* (Op. Edit. Migne, PP. Græc., t. xcix., p. 1017.) ὦ θειοτάτη τῶν ὧν κεφαλῶν κεφαλή.—See also epist. xxxiv., p. 1024.

pastor of the whole Church under heaven ;[376] Apostolic head over all appointed by God, pastor of the sheep of Christ, keeper of the kingdom of heaven, rock of the faith, upon which the Catholic Church was built, Peter himself holding and governing the See of Peter."[377] He asserts that the Papal authority is from God,[378] and therefore he calls his princedom in the Church divine.[379] In accordance with these expressions, he styles the Roman Church the head of all the Churches, through which we unite ourselves with the three Patriarchs,[380] supreme over all the Churches of God, the supreme chair, the foundation of the Universal Church on earth.[381] He states to the Emperor Michael that, according to the primitive tradition the doctrine of faith is to be transmitted from Rome ;[382] and from it the certainty of faith is to be derived.[383] So that he thus begins his letter to Pope Leo : "Since Christ our God, after bestowing the keys of the kingdom of heaven, conferred upon the great Peter the dignity of pastoral supremacy, it is necessary that reference should be had to Peter, or to his successor, when those who go astray from the truth attempt to bring innovations into the Catholic

[376] S. Theodorus Stud. : L. c., p. 1020. Σῶσον ἡμᾶς ἀρχιποίμεν τῆς ὑπ' οὐρανὸν Ἐκκλησίας.

[377] *Ibid.*, *Epist.*, l. i.. epist. xii., *ad Paschalem Papam*, p. 1152 ; et l. i., epist. xxiv., *ad Leonem Papam*, p. 1025.

[378] *Ibid.*, *Epist.*, l. ii., epist. xii., p. 1153. Ἔχεις τὸ ἰσχύειν παρὰ Θεῷ ἐκ τοῦ πάντων πρωτεύειν.

[379] *Ibid.*, *Epist.*, l. ii., epist. xxxiii., *ad Leonem Papam*, p. 1020.

[380] *Ibid.*, *Epist.*, l. ii., epist. lxxiv., *ad Michaelem Imp.*, p. 1309.

[381] *Ibid.*, *Epist.*, l. i., epist. xxxv., *ad Basilium Archim.*, p. 1029 ; l. ii., epist. lxii., *ad Fratres*, p. 1280 ; epist. lxvi., p. 1289 ; epist. lxxvi., p. 1332, &c.

[382] *Ibid.*, *Epist.*, l. ii., epist. lxxxvii., *ad Michaelem Imp.*, p. 1332.

[383] *Ibid.*, *Epist.*, l. ii., epist. cxxix., *ad Leonem Sacellarium*, p. 1420. We shall quote this important passage in the second volume of this work.

Church."[384] We defy criticism so to strain these passages as to prevent a full acknowledgment of the Pope's divine supremacy being drawn from them. During the ninth century then, at which time fatal schism was at hand, the persuasion of the divine jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff had struck very deep root in the East; and we learn, from the plainest facts and least disputed documents of that age, that this belief was not checked in the beginning of the Photian schism.

VIII. As soon as the impious Emperor Michael had deposed Ignatius, and raised to the Patriarchal see Photius, a layman and a soldier, he was filled with anxiety lest his usurpations should be counteracted and opposed by the authority of the Roman Pontiff. He therefore sent ambassadors to Nicholas I. with the most calumnious accusations against the holy Patriarch Ignatius.[385] But Nicholas, not misled by the craft of the Greek Emperor, assumed, as a matter of course, the character of supreme judge. He reserved to his own tribunal the cause of Ignatius and Photius.[386] And at the same time he solemnly declared that his authority in the Church was supreme, that it extended over all the sheep of Christ, that it was a divine authority, to the decrees of which people and emperors must submit; for the power of emperors is confined to temporal things, whilst the authority of the supreme pastor embraces the spiritual interests of the Church and of souls. He pressed these truths strongly upon all the bishops of the Eastern Churches,[387] upon Photius,[388] and

[384] S. Theodorus Stud.: *Epist.*, l. ii., epist. xxxiii., *ad Leonem Papam*, p. 1018.

[385] Pope Nicholas I. relates it in his *Epist.* i., *ad Univ. Cath.* (Labbe, t. x., p. 1289).

[386] *Ibid.*, *Epist.* iii., *ad Photium* (Labbe, t. ix., p. 1297).

[387] *Ibid.*, *Epist.* i., cit., l.c.

[388] *Ibid.*, *Epist.* vi., *ad Photium* (Labbe, l. c., p. 1303, seq.).

the Emperor Michael, to whom, with pastoral authority, he points out what duties regarding ecclesiastical affairs belong to him as Emperor.[389] Afterwards, in the synod assembled in Rome, he pronounces the final sentence of anathema and deposition against Photius, and decrees the restoration of Ignatius to the see of Constantinople, from which injustice and violence had expelled him. With divinely-conferred authority he communicated his definitive sentence to the Emperor,[390] to Photius,[391] to Ignatius,[392] and to the clergy and the senate of Constantinople ;[393] reminding them in each of these letters of the divine supremacy entrusted to the Apostolic See, that all might understand the ground whereon he rested his claim to the authority of supreme judge. Although, despite the exhortations and the reproaches of the Sovereign Pontiff,[394] Michael failed to obey, Basil, his successor, fully submitted to the Papal decrees. In his letter to Pope Nicholas, he called the sentence Apostolic and divine ;[395] he acknowledged the Roman Pontiff to be the pastor appointed by Christ to rule the Universal Church ;[396] and he begged of the Pope to give still greater solemnity to his sentence by pronouncing it before the apocrisiarius deputed by Ignatius

[389] Pope Nicholas I.: *Epist.* ii., v., *ad Michaelem Imp.* (Labbe, l. c., p. 1291, seq., et p. 1299, seq.).

[390] *Ibid.*, *Epist.* vii., *ad eundem* (Labbe, l. c., pp. 1307—11).

[391] *Ibid.*, *Epist.* xi., *ad Photium* (Labbe, l. c., p. 1389, seq.).

[392] *Ibid.*, *Epist.* xiii., *ad Ignatium Patriarch.* (Labbe, l. c., p. 1400, seq.).

[393] *Ibid.*, *Epist.* x., *ad Clerum Constant.* (l. c., p. 1370, seq.) ; *Epist.* xiv., *ad Senat. Const.*, p. 1407.

[394] See the *Epist.* viii. and ix. of Pope Nicholas to the Emperor Michael (Labbe, l. c., pp. 1316—1370).

[395] *Epist. Basilii Imp. ad Nicolaum I.*, in act. iii. Conc. viii. Œcum. (Labbe, t. x., p. 516). When that letter arrived, Adrian II. held the Pontifical See, after the death of Pope Nicholas I.

[396] L. c., p. 517.

and Photius jointly to the Holy See.[397] No sooner was Ignatius restored to his see, than in a letter addressed to the Pope he again gave the clearest testimony to the divine supremacy. In this letter he calls the Pope, "The head of us all, and of the spouse of Christ, the Catholic and Apostolic Church;" and he adds that, "the words which Christ addressed to St. Peter (St. Matt. xvi. 18, 19) were not confined or limited to the chief of the Apostles only, but through him were transmitted to all who, after him, should like him be chief pastors and most divine sacred Pontiffs of the elder Rome."[398] Such language is diametrically opposed to that held by partisans of schism. But we would rather refer to the Eighth Œcumenical Council, in order to show how far the authority claimed at that time by Nicholas I. was acknowledged without opposition by the whole Oriental Church. Adrian II., through his legates, imposed a formulary of union to be signed by all the Fathers of the synod,[399] in which the divine supremacy of the Apostolic See is asserted in the very words of the previous formulary of union proposed by Pope Hormisdas. It runs as follows: "By following in all things the Apostolic See, and observing all its decrees, we hope to be enabled to join communion with the same Apostolic See, in which the solidity of the Christian religion is to be found in its truth and integrity. And we promise not to recite at the holy mysteries the names of those who are cut off from the communion of the holy Church—that is to say, who do not agree with the Apostolic See." The Papal legates

[397] L. c., p. 517.

[398] *Epist. S. Ignatii Patriarchæ ad Nicolaum Papam* (Labbe, l. c., pp. 517-18).

[399] *In act.* i. *Conc. Œcum.* viii. (Labbe, t. x., pp. 497-98). That formulary had been proposed by Nicholas I. to the Greek Church, and Adrian II. prescribed the same in the synod.

read this formulary, and asked the Fathers whether they admitted it; general acclamations testified their approval of it as they cried out that *it pleased them.*[400] Nor was this all. After the death of Ignatius, Pope John VIII. was led by reasons of prudence to yield to the prayers of the Emperor Basil, and to confirm Photius in the Patriarchate; but the Pontiff was most careful to impose as a condition that Photius should recant in a public synod all that he had uttered against the authority and doctrines of the Catholic Church.[401] All know how the hypocrite complied with this requirement;[402] but still he could not avoid giving public testimony to the supremacy of the Apostolic See, for he was persuaded that by this solemn declaration he should strengthen his own power. Although he interpolated all the letters of Pope John VIII. he did not dare to suppress the Pontiff's claim to his divine authority, nor his plain statement of his supremacy in the Church. In the synod held by Photius at Constantinople (A.D. 879), he read the interpolated letter of Pope John to the Emperor Basil, wherein we find the following words: "The Apostolic See received the keys of the kingdom

[400] L. c., p. 500.

[401] Joannes VIII.: *Epist.* cxcix., *ad Basilium Imp.* (Labbe, t. xi., p. 128, seq.). When Photius had heard of his condemnation by Nicholas I., and of the mission of the Papal legates into Bulgaria, he sent to the Oriental Patriarchs a most bitter encyclical against the doctrines of the Latin Church. (*Epist.* xiii. *Photii.* Op., t. ii. Edit. Migne, p. 721, seq.) Then, assembling a synod at Constantinople, he audaciously pronounced a sentence of excommunication and deposition against Nicholas I.—See Anastasius, *in Præf. ad Conc.* viii. (Labbe, t. x., p. 476); Jager, *Histoire de Photius*, l. v., p. 146, seq. 2nd Edit. Paris.

[402] Photius interpolated the letters of Pope John, in order to save himself from the humiliating recantation of his errors.—See them in Labbe, t. x., p. 966, seq., p. 983, seq.; t. xi., p. 132, seq., p. 141, seq.

of heaven from the Great Pontiff Jesus Christ through Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, to whom He said, 'To thee I will give the keys,' &c. It has the power of binding and loosing throughout the world. . . By the authority, therefore, of Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, we, in union with the holy Church, announce to you, and through you to all our holy brothers and fellow-ministers, the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and all other bishops and priests, and to the whole Church of Constantinople, that we consent and agree to all things which you have asked." The letter then proceeds: "Receive Photius as the Patriarch of your Church, and conform your love and faith, and with reverence obey him and through him the holy Roman Church, for whosoever receives him not, receives not our decrees or those of the holy Roman Church concerning him; nor does such a one wage war against him only, but against the most holy Apostle Peter, yea, even against Christ the Son of God."[403] When the Fathers of the synod were asked by Peter, cardinal and legate of the Holy See, whether they agreed with the letter of the Roman Pontiff in all its parts, all joined with Photius in answering that they agreed.[404] In like manner other letters of John VIII. were read in which the same doctrine of the Pope's divine supremacy was repeatedly asserted, and unanimous consent was given to them by the synod.[405] When Photius soon afterwards cast off his hypocritical mask, John VIII. inflicted upon him a sentence of excommunication and deposition,[406] and Leo the Wise, successor of the Emperor Basil,

[403] *Epist. Joannis VIII. ad Basil. Imp.* (corrupta a Photio) in act. ii. Conc. Photiani (Labbe, t. xi., p. 366, seq.).

[404] L. c., p. 378.

[405] Labbe, l. c., pp. 383, 426, seq.

[406] *De Pseudo-Synodo Photii*, in App. ad Conc. viii. (Labbe, t. x., p. 953).

executed both this sentence and that of Stephen VI., the successor of John.[407] Additional proofs of our position might be derived from the letter written on that occasion by the Oriental Bishops, Stylianus, Eusebius, &c., to Stephen VI.;[408] and from those of Stephen to the Emperor[409] and to all the Eastern bishops;[410] and of the Popes Formosus[411] and John IX.,[412] to Stylianus; and it must be observed that these testimonies belong to the very time when Photius was gratifying his pride and ambition by promoting the great schism. The Eastern Church remained united with that of Rome until Michael Cerularius obtained the Patriarchal See of Constantinople. Ambition of the Emperors, no less than of the Patriarchs, and shameful servility on the part of the clergy towards their temporal princes, were the true causes of that deplorable schism which detached from the centre of union one of the noblest Churches of Christendom, and cast it down into ignominious slavery under the Sultans of Constantinople.[413] Up to the time of the infliction of this tremendous punishment, the Apostolic See spared no efforts to avert it, and to recall to union the portion of Christ's flock that had so miserably gone astray. The two Councils of Lyons and Florence remain as noble monuments of the endea-

[407] L. c.

[408] *Epistolæ Styliani aliorumque Episcoporum ad Stephanum VI. Papam*, in App. Conc. viii., cit. (Labbe, t. x., p. 902, seq., p. 914, seq.).

[409] *Epist. Stephani VI. ad Basilium Imp.* (Labbe, l. c., p. 895, seq.). The Emperor Basil was dead when the letter of Pope Stephen reached Constantinople.

[410] *Epist. Stephani VI. ad omnes ubique Episcopos* (Labbe, l. c., p. 911).

[411] *Epist.* i., *Formosi Papæ ad Stylianum* (Labbe, t. xi., p. 612).

[412] *Epist.* ii., *Joannis IX. ad Stylianum* (Labbe, l. c., p. 688).

[413] See Pitzipios: *L'Eglise Orientale*, pt. iii., c. i., p. 82, seq. Rome, 1855.

vours made by the Roman Pontiffs to bring back the Eastern Church to Catholic unity. In both these councils the whole episcopate, as well as the Byzantine Emperors, acknowledged the divine supremacy of the Roman See, and testified to it by documents, which their relapse into schism has not been able to invalidate.[414]

IX. After all the proofs which we have brought forward, it is strange that the leading writers of the High Church in England should deny that the Greek Church ever acknowledged the existence of such a divine authority in Christendom. It is yet more strange to read in the *Eirenicon* that, "The conditions of reconciliation (imposed on the Eastern Church) were absolute submission to an authority which had grown up since the separation."[415] To maintain that the Papal supremacy was wholly unknown to the Greek Church up to the time when Michael Cerularius broke the bonds of union with the West, betrays great ignorance of the history of the Greek empire and Church. Dr. Pusey, in a succeeding passage, professes not to understand how it can be that the Eastern Church "is no part of the Church of Christ, because it does not subject itself to the West, under which God did not place it?"[416] But in this sentence the author falls into the fallacy which in logic is called a *petitio principii;* and assumes as certain two principles, both of which are not only unproved, but false—first, that Christ did not institute in His Church any supremacy in the person of St. Peter and his successors; and secondly, that the Greek

[414] *Formula Fidei Mich. Imp.*, in Conc. Lugdun. (Labbe, t. xiv., p. 511). *Sacramentum Græcorum* (Labbe, l. c., p. 516). *Decretum Unionis*, in Conc. Florentino (Labbe, l. c., p. 1183). In the eighth section we shall speak of this important decree.

[415] *Eirenicon*, p. 62.

[416] L. c., p. 63.

Church never acknowledged such a supremacy, nor submitted to it. Moreover, in order to judge of the sentiments of the Greeks, even before their schism, we must not look, as Dr. Pusey has done, to the writings of Elias Meniates, Bishop of Zerniza, towards the end of the seventeenth century.[417] We agree with the Oxford divine, that at present "the chief controversy between the Greek and the Latin Church, as between Protestants and Catholics, is the supreme power of the Pope;" but we do not hold with him that the dispute about the supreme power of the Pope was the principal cause of the separation of the Greeks from the Catholic Church. The facts and documents produced in the course of this section afford sufficient evidence of our assertion, and free us from the necessity of giving any further proof. But Dr. Pusey goes on to remark, on the authority of the Archimandrite Macarius,[418] "That the great Russian empire, converted to the faith by the preaching of monks and missionary bishops *since the separation of the East from the West*, is a witness to the Greek Church that she is a true member of the one Church."[419] The author evidently misconceives the history of the conversion of the Russian empire, and thus, from an erroneous supposition, draws a consequence which cannot stand modern criticism.[420] The true date of the conversion of the Russians to Christianity is undeniably to be placed between the middle of the tenth century and the middle of the eleventh. For although some attempt to convert that nation had been made under the Emperor Basil, in

[417] *Eirenicon*, p. 63.

[418] *History of Christianity in Russia*, p. 394 (in the *Eirenicon*, p. 62).

[419] *Eirenicon*, l. c.

[420] It is pitiful to find that A. Possevin, in his pamphlet, *De Rebus Muscovitis* (pt. ii., p. 92), fell into the same mistake. But the criticism of the age of Possevin was not that of the present time.

A.D. 876, and a bishop consecrated at that time by the Patriarch Ignatius had been sent into Russia,[421] no very great fruit was gathered from that mission, nor from any of the others which were sent, probably, after the deposition of Ignatius, and which Photius extolled with so much vanity in his famous encyclical.[422] The true beginning of the conversion of the Russians is to be found in the year 955, when the Grand Duchess Olga was baptised at Constantinople.[423] Her conversion, however, did not immediately incline the bulk of the nation to embrace the faith of Christ; but when her grandson, Wladimir, became a Christian (988), the Russians flocked in great crowds to receive baptism in the Dnieper. From that time Christianity continued to make great progress in Russia, until, under Jaroslav, it became firmly established (1019—1054).[424] Now, during the whole of this period, the Greek Church was in full communion with Rome, and in regular subjection to the Apostolic See; the fatal schism did not begin till the year 1054, when the sentence of excommunication was pronounced by the Papal legates against Michael Ceru-

[421] Constantinus Porphyrogenitus: *In Vita Basilii* (Theophanes Contin., n. 97. Edit. Bonnæ, p. 343, seq.) Cedrenus: *Hist.*, t. ii., p. 242. Edit. Bonnæ.

[422] The learned Asseman not only proved the falsehood of what Photius wrote in that encyclical about the conversion of Russia, but also asserted that the whole of that encyclical was concocted by Photius after the year 869, as if he had written and published it long before his exile.—See *Kalendarium Ecclesiæ Univ.*, t. ii., pt. ii., c. i., sec. xiv., p. 253, seq. Romæ, 1755.

[423] Const. Porphyrog.: *De Caeremoniis Aulæ Byzantinæ*, l. ii., c. xv., p. 594. Edit. Bonnæ. See also—Stilting: *De Conversione et Fide Russorum*, sec. ii. (*Acta SS.*, t. ii., Septembris, p. v., seq.). F. Gagarin: *Origines Catholiques de l'Eglise Russe*, sec. iii. (*Etudes Théolog. Hist.*, t. ii., 1857, p. 161, seq.).

[424] See the documents in Op. cit. of Stilting, l. c., secs. iii., iv. (*Acta SS.*, t. c., p. vi., seq.). Gagarin: l. c., secs. iv., v. (l. c., p. 174, seq.).

larius.[425] But we do not intend to dwell on this subject, the difficulties of which have already received satisfactory explanation;[426] we are content to refer the reader to the learned works of Count de Maistre,[427] Aug. Galitzin,[428] F. J. Gagarin,[429] P. C. Tondini,[430] &c. These writers contain a valuable collection of extracts from the original ancient liturgical books of the Russian Church. The divine supremacy of the Pope will be found to be stated with so much clearness and emphasis as to make it impossible to maintain that those documents were framed by a church which had not from its cradle been under the influence of Rome.

[425] Stilting: Op. cit., secs. v., vi. (l. c., p. xii., seq.). Gagarin: l. c., secs. vi., vii. (l. c., p. 210, seq.).

[426] Besides the two above-mentioned works of Stilting and Gagarin, see also—Vizzardelli: *Dissertatio de Origine Christianæ Religionis in Russia.* Romæ, 1826. Blätter, in his *Political Hist.*, t. iv., ix. Theiner: *De la Situation de l'Eglise Catholique des deux rites en Pologne et en Russie*, &c.

[427] *Du Pape*, l. i., c. x.

[428] *Un Missionaire Russe en Amerique.* Append. Paris, 1856.

[429] *Les Starovères*, or *l'Eglise Russe, et le Pape*, sec. vi. (Etudes cit., t. ii., 1857, p. 64, seq.).

[430] *La Primauté de Saint Pierre prouvée par les titres que lui donne l'Eglise Russe dans sa Liturgie.* Paris, 1867.

SECTION VI.

FALSE DECRETALS—AFRICAN CONTROVERSY—CANONS OF SARDICA ON APPEALS CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE.

I. WHAT we have seen of the relations between the Eastern Church and the Apostolic See, would not have prepared us for the assertion so frequently made that the present state of isolation of the Eastern, as well as of the English Church, is owing to the forgery of the False Decretals. Yet Dr. Pusey attributes to these that practical system of authority which, he thinks, completely changed the position the Roman Church occupied in the fourth and fifth centuries.[431] The documents produced in the two foregoing sections are more than sufficient to show that the Decretals had nothing to do with the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff, which the Latin and the Greek Church alike had ever acknowledged. Neither Emperors nor Patriarchs would have submitted to it, had they not been persuaded of its divine origin. The East most certainly had no knowledge of the False Decretals; nor was any appeal made to them by the Popes when exercising a supreme jurisdiction over the Eastern Patriarchates. That jurisdiction had been exercised by the Popes, both in the East and in the West, long before the appearance of the so-called *Isidorian Collection* in the ninth century, and those who maintain the contrary should produce proof that for nine centuries the Pope was no more than *primus inter pares*, and regarded as such both by East and West.

[431] *Eirenicon*, p. 236, seq.

And even if—which is impossible—this were demonstrated, still it would remain to be shown that the universal and supreme authority of the Popes was built upon the False Decretals. For had the collection changed the essential constitution of the Church, set up over all an authority unknown for nine centuries, and given to it rights and prerogatives nowhere previously heard of, how could such a collection have found acceptance in the Church? Nicholas I., contemporary of the author of that collection, solemnly asserted and maintained, both in the West and East, his supreme divine authority, and exercised its rights and privileges, and yet no objection was raised against his pretensions on the part of either the Western or of the Eastern episcopate. Dr. Pusey has fallen into two great mistakes in this matter. The first is to believe with Fleury—a bitter Gallican—and with some very few Protestants, that the Papal power was increased by the Forged Decretals;[432] the second is to believe that "The system built upon that forgery abides still;" which leads him to say that, "The Greek Church could not be admitted to communion with the West without merging its whole Patriarchal, or episcopal system, such as it inherited from the times of the undivided Church, so that her bishops should be the mere delegates of the Roman Pontiff, liable to be deposed at his mere will, as the eighty French bishops were by Pope Pius VII., in his concordat with Napoleon I. Our communion was rejected, because our forefathers used the same freedom which the Church of St. Augustine enjoyed."[433] By *the system built on this forgery*, the author appears to mean the divine supremacy of the Pope in full exercise in the Universal Church. Now as regards the first mistake, reference should have been made to some writer of more authority

[432] *Eirenicon*, p. 237, seq. [433] *Ibid.*, p. 256.

on the origin and bearing of the Decretals than the Abbé Fleury. The merest tyro in Canon Law knows that the false opinion of Fleury, and of two other writers, A. Theiner and H. E. Eichhorn, is at present abandoned on every hand, and almost forgotten. Several writers of great erudition and ability, Protestant as well as Catholic, have discussed the matter, and have come to a totally different conclusion. In addition to the two Ballerini, whose opinion is of the very greatest weight, we may cite Walter, Rosshirt, Möhler, Spittler, Plank, Drosle-Hulshoff, Knust, A. Wasserschleben, Gfrörer, Hefele, Denzinger, Phillips, and Hinschius; and this list could be increased, if necessary. The works of these writers show that the age of the Abbé Fleury and of Du Pin is dead and buried; history requires, in these our times, deep, critical study, not fanciful and *à priori* views and puerile declamations.[434]

II. As regards the second error, we do not know to what scholar Dr. Pusey could make appeal in support of his opinion. The Popes, as we have proved, evidently exercised their supreme jurisdiction over the whole Church long before the False Decretals had appeared in the West. Their authority was based on the words addressed by Christ to St. Peter; and on this head, at least, the Decretals contain nothing which was not laid down by the Apostles, and constantly practised in the Universal Church. Again, we are startled at meeting with the bold assertion that the Church of England is now no more independent of Rome, in fact, than was the African Church in the time of Augustine.[435] We

[434] We do not intend to speak here of the true author of the Decretals, nor of the age in which they were put in circulation. This controversy, which has been so well treated by many learned writers, does not concern our argument so nearly as to make the discussion of it necessary.

[435] *Eirenicon*, p. 256, and p. 66, seq.

do not intend at present to explain at length the controversy which arose in the African Church on the occasion of the appeal of Apiarius to the Apostolic See. But we will make some remarks on the subject, in order to solve the groundless objection against the Catholic doctrine, which is based on the incident. In the first place, St. Augustine, who is quoted as an authority upon this point by the author of the *Eirenicon*, bears clear testimony against the teaching of that book, for he acknowledges that even in the year 311, before the Councils of Nicæa (325) and of Sardica (347), the Popes had exercised the supreme jurisdiction to decide ecclesiastical disputes which arose in the African Church.[436] In another place the same great Doctor openly confesses that the Apostolic See held its supremacy long before the assembling of the First General Council in the Church.[437] Secondly, it is altogether erroneous to assume that in 419 the African Church either was ignorant of, or contradicted, the claim of the Pope to receive appeals, and to reverse, if he saw proper, the sentence of all ecclesiastical tribunals, or to appoint new judges who should pronounce their sentence without appeal. It is true that the African Fathers did not find in the records of the Nicene Council the canons to which Pope Zosimus appealed in his *Commonitorium;* nevertheless, they restored Apiarius to his former degree, according to the sentence of the Papal legates, who had been associated with the neighbouring bishops by the Roman Pontiff as judges in that cause.[438] They could not refuse submission since they had always acknowledged

[436] S. Augustinus: *Epist.* xliii., nn. 7, 9 (Op., t. ii. Edit. Maur., pp. 69, 70).

[437] *In Romana Ecclesia semper Apostolicæ Cathedræ viguit principatus, &c.*, l. c., n. 7, p. 69.

[438] See the vi. *Council of Carthage* (Labbe, t. iii., p. 443, seq.); *Epist. Concilii ad Bonifacium I.*, n. 2 (Coustant., p. 1011).

the Roman Pontiff as the Vicar of Christ upon earth. Besides, as the learned Ballerini remarks,[439] in all the letters addressed by the bishops of Africa to Popes Boniface I. and Celestine I., there is nothing which can be understood to imply the least idea of resistance to the supreme jurisdiction of the Pope in receiving appeals. All the reasons alleged in them by the African Fathers refer to the discipline of the African Church, which, as they thought, was not at variance with any decree of a general council. Their reasons referred, also, to the distance of the two countries, the difficulties of procuring the necessary information, the danger of scandal which would frequently arise, and other inconveniences, which do not relate to any claim of jurisdiction. Nay, they made no objection to appeals of bishops to the Roman Pontiff, but only to those of the inferior clergy, to whom, according to the ancient customs of the African Church, appeal to the Roman tribunal was not allowed. On this account decrees had been made in the Council of Hippo (393), and in that of Carthage (397), that the causes of simple priests should be definitively settled by the sentence of six bishops. But after the case of Apiarius, greater allowances were made in favour of the inferior clergy, for they were enabled to appeal to the provincial synods, and even to the general councils of all Africa. There is no mention of any decree in the African councils by which a bishop is prevented from appealing to the Apostolic See, for it was always understood that the *causæ majores* were to be definitely judged by the supreme tribunal of the Roman Pontiff. In conformity with this state of the law, the letter addressed by the African bishops to Pope Celestine supplicated him not to admit the appeals of the inferior clergy, for this

[439] Ballerini: *Observationes in* i. *partem Dissert.* v. *Quesnelli*, n. 30 (in Op. S. Leonis, t. ii., p. 971).

would be against the ancient discipline of the African Church. But with regard to the bishops, they besought the Pope not to receive their appeals so easily, or to listen to their defence.[440] In proof of this, we may cite the instance of Anthony, Bishop of Fussala, who being deposed from his episcopal administration, appealed to Pope Boniface, the successor of Zozimus, and afterwards to Celestine. This Pope sent legates into Africa to execute his sentence. Now the Africans did not deny the jurisdiction of the two Popes who received the appeal, but they complained only of the manner in which the Apostolic sentence had been carried into execution, the Papal legates having called in the support of the civil authorities. Complaint was also made of the deceitful means used by Bishop Anthony to gain the Pope over to his side.[441] The African Church never denied the right of the Pope to receive appeals in the case of bishops, and even of priests. Such a denial was impossible, since that Church had always looked upon the Roman Bishop, as not only its Patriarch, but also the supreme pastor of the Universal Church.[442] Yet, in the face of all this, we are told that the Anglican Church is not now more independent of Rome than was the African Church in the time of St. Augustine. Had the author of the *Eirenicon* attentively considered, with the learned Schelestrate and Ballerini, the ancient monuments of the African Church, he would not have ventured upon so sweeping an assertion. We refer the reader to the passage in which Mr. Allies, in his

[440] See Ballerini in *Observ.* cit., c. vi., nn. 20, 21, &c. (l. c., p. 955, seq.).

[441] See S. August.: *Epist.* ccix., n. 9 (Op., t. ii., p. 593); *Epist. Afrorum ad Cœlestinum Papam* (Coustant., p. 1058, seq.); Bini, *Notæ in Conc. Carth.* (Labbe, t. iii., p. 455, seq.).

[442] Schelestrate: *Ecclesia Africana*, dissert. i., c. viii., p. 56. Parisiis, 1679.

pamphlet on the *Ancient Church*, contrasts Anglican independence of the Pope and the union of the African Church with him in St. Augustine's age.[443] We further invite attention to the Catholic epistle of the African bishops of the seventh century to Pope Martin in the Lateran Council, wherein they bear the most solemn testimony to the faith of their Fathers and predecessors in acknowledging the divine supremacy of the Apostolic See.[444]

III. But Dr. Pusey, in common with many other anti-Catholic writers, insists on the Canons of Sardica as proving that the Papal prerogative of receiving appeals does not rest on any divinely conferred right, but is of merely ecclesiastical institution. A scholar is certainly far behind the present age in historical erudition who does not know that, long before the Council of Sardica, the Popes received appeals from all Churches and passed definitive sentence, especially in those causes of great importance which were called *causæ majores*. The history of antiquity has preserved the records of the appeals of Privatus Lambesitanus, who had been condemned by a synod of ninety bishops (250);[445] of Basilides of Astorga, and Martial of Merida (262);[446] of Paul of Samosata, who had been deposed in the Council of Antioch (262);[447] and of many similar cases. But especial mention must be made of the appeal of St. Athanasius and of the other bishops who, on account

[443] Allies: *Dr. Pusey and the Ancient Church*, p. 61, seq.

[444] Labbe, t. vii., p. 131, seq.

[445] See Coustant.: *Epist. RR. PP.—Notitia epist. non extant. Stephani Papæ*, n. ii., p. 223. In the course of this section we shall answer the remarks of Dr. Pusey on this appeal.

[446] See Balutius: *Nota in Epist.* lxviii. *S. Cypriani*, p. 492. Edit. Parisiis, 1726. Pamelius *in Adnot. in Epist. cit.*

[447] Zaccaria: *Antifebronio*, pt. ii., l. iii., c. ii., sec. 6, p. 464, seq. Cesenæ, 1770.

of their heroic defence of the consubstantiality of the Divine Word, had been expelled from their sees by the Arians. Julius heard them, absolved them as innocent, and with supreme authority restored them to the sees of which they had been most unjustly deprived.[448] That important judgment of the Roman See took place, according to some authorities, in 337,[449] according to others, in 341:[450] that is at least six years before the Council of Sardica, which did not meet till 347. Thus, whatever the Canons of Sardica imply, they certainly did not bestow on the Popes any new right, any right which had not been inherent in them by virtue of their divine supremacy, and which they had not long before exercised in the Universal Church.[451] But the fact is, the Canons of Sardica contain nothing which favours the interpretation put upon them.

IV. The well known Canons of Sardica in question are three in number: the third, the fourth, and the seventh —which in the Greek text is numbered as the fifth.[452]

[448] Socrates: H. E., l. ii., capp. xi., xv. Edit. Valesii, pp. 89, 91. Sozomenus: H. E., l. iii., c. viii. Edit. Valesii, p. 507.

[449] Coustant.: Op. cit., p. 351. Zaccaria: *Thesaurus Theolog.*, t. vii., pt. i., p. 725, seq.

[450] Valesius: *Observationes in Socr. et Sozom.*, l. i., c. iii., p. 175.

[451] This argument has been treated with great erudition by—Ballerini: *Observationes in pt.* i., *diss.* v., *Quesnellii* (in Op. S. Leonis, t. ii., p. 925, seq.). Lupus: *Summum Rom. Apost. Sedis Privilegium circa Evocationes et Appellationes.* Bononiæ, 1742. Zaccaria: Op. cit., pt. ii., c. ii., n. 8, p. 470, seq. Stefanucci: *Dissert. de Appellationibus ad Rom. Pontif.* Edit. 1768.

[452] The three Canons of Sardica are as follows: Canon iii. "Si in aliqua provincia aliquis episcopus contra fratrem suum episcopum litem habuerit, ne unus ex duobus ex alia provincia advocet episcopum cognitorem. Quod si aliquis episcoporum judicatus fuerit in aliqua causa et putet se bonam causam habere, ut iterum concilium renovetur; si vobis placet, S. Petri Apostoli memoriam honoremus, ut scribatur ab his qui causam examinarunt, Julio Rom. Episcopo; et si judicaverit renovandum esse judicium,

Now, the first of these does not relate to appeals; the other two acknowledge appeals to the Pope as an historical fact, but they make no new enactment whatever regarding the right of appealing to the Apostolic See. The words, "Let us honour the memory of the holy Apostle Peter," belong to the Third Canon only, by which a new discipline was introduced, in no way relating to appeals, nor to any revision whatever. According to the old discipline, a bishop who had been condemned by a synod of his own province could appeal to a second synod, which was to be formed of the bishops of the neighbouring province. These were to be summoned according to the ordinary procedure by the metropolitan; but, by abuse, they had sometimes been convoked by the condemned bishop, or by his accuser.[453] The Fathers of Sardica, in the first part of their Third Canon, forbade this abuse. Moreover,

renovetur, et det judices. Si autem probaverit talem causam esse ut non refricentur ea quæ acta sunt; quæ decreverit confirmata erunt." Canon iv. "Gaudentius episcopus dixit: Addendum si placet, huic sententiæ quam plenam sanctitate protulistis, ut cum aliquis episcopus depositus fuerit eorum episcoporum judicio, qui in vicinis locis commorantur, et proclamaverit agendum sibi negotium in urbe Roma; alter episcopus in ejus cathedra, post appellationem ejus qui videtur esse depositus, omnino non ordinetur nisi causa fuerit in judicio Episcopi Romani determinata" (Labbe, t. ii., p. 674). Canon vii. "Si episcopus accusatus fuerit, et omnes judicaverint episcopi regionis ipsius, et de gradu suo eum dejecerint, si appellaverit et confugerit ad beatissimum Rom. Ecclesiæ Episcopum, et voluerit se audiri; si justum putaverit, ut renovetur examen, scribere his episcopis dignetur Episcopus Rom. qui in finitima et propinqua aliqua provincia sunt, ut ipsi diligenter omnia requirant, et juxta fidem veritatis definiant. Quod si is . . . deprecatione sua moverit Episcopum Rom., ut de latere suo Presbyteros mittat, erit in potestate quid velit et quid æstimet," &c. (*Ibid.*, p. 675).

[453] Marchetti: *Dissert. sul Conc. di Sardica*, p. ii., sec. ii., n. 30, seq., p. 133, seq. Roma, 1789.

with regard to the convocation of the second synod by the metropolitan, they changed the old discipline, for they decreed that, should the bishop condemned by a synod ask for a second trial, the matter should be referred to the Pope, that he might judge whether or not justice required it, and if so, appoint new judges. This is the literal sense of the canon, which can hardly bear a different meaning.[454] The simple perusal of the text will be sufficient to prove that the canon in question does not grant any appeal, nor even any revision of the cause, as De Marca inclines to think, and as Dr. Pusey so positively asserts; this opinion being founded on the fact that according to the Latin text, the Pope is requested to appoint the judge of the new tribunal, and in the Greek he is requested to refer the case to the bishops of the neighbouring province.[455] As regards the Fourth Canon, we have in it one of the best proofs of the ancient and legitimate right of the Pope to receive appeals, and to correct the sentences of synods when he found them erroneous. For the bearing of the canon in question is simply to suspend the effect of every sentence of deposition and condemnation pronounced by the provincial synods in the second instance until the Pope had decided the cause of the appellants. But the council did not say whether or not bishops who had been judged in the second instance could appeal to the Pope; nor does it expressly grant to deposed bishops the privilege of such an appeal. The council states no more than the following hypothetical case: "Should the deposed bishop declare that he will pursue his cause at Rome, after the appeal made by him who has been deposed, no other bishop must be ordained in his place

[454] Marchetti: l. c.

[455] *διὰ τῶν γειτνιώντων τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ ἐπισκόπων, εἰ δέοι, ἀνανεωθῆναι τὸ δικαστήριον* (Labbe, t. ii., p. 660).

till the cause be decided by the judgment of the Roman Bishop." We conclude then from this canon—(1.) that the custom of appealing to the Pope, after the sentence of the tribunal in the second instance, existed long before the Council of Sardica, and remained unmodified by the decrees of that council; (2.) that since the judgment of the Pope was effectual to annul the sentence of the tribunal in the second instance, the Council of Sardica thought fit to decree that in case of appeal to the Pope no bishop should be ordained in the place of him who was deposed, because, should the sentence of deposition be reversed, the newly-elected bishop would remain without a see. The meaning of this canon is so evident that it is needless to spend more time on the explanation of it. Finally, the Seventh Canon is so plain as scarcely to require elucidation. The object is to enforce the ordinary discipline of the Church concerning appeals to the supreme tribunal in causes which had not passed through the courts of inferior jurisdiction. Doubtless, in case of appeal, the Pope could *ex plenitudine potestatis* decide a cause which had been judged by a tribunal of the first instance only; but the council intended to state and enforce the ordinary discipline which the Pope, as supreme defender of the laws of the Church, ought in ordinary cases to maintain and enforce; a decree was therefore enacted that, "Should a bishop, judged and deposed by a tribunal of the first instance, appeal to the Pope, if the Pontiff thinks fit to grant a new trial, he will be pleased to write to the bishops of the neighbouring province to examine the cause in synod. But it will be in his power, if he pleases, to send his legates to the synod, that they may take part in the judgment." We see then that in this canon, no more than in the one we have before considered, the right of the appellant is not questioned as if such appeals were a new practice, unheard of before the Council of Sardica;

the right is, on the contrary, fully acknowledged by the Fathers as a legitimate course of proceeding, which they by no means censure or reform. Thus there is no colour for the assertion that the Popes were endowed with the new prerogative of receiving appeals by the Canons of Sardica alone.

V. Dr. Pusey seems to believe that Pope Zosimus, in the *Commonitorium* given to the legates whom he sent to Africa,[456] quotes the Third Canon of Sardica; but this is not so, and hence the remarks of the learned professor on the words, "Let us honour the memory of the holy Apostle Peter," on which so great a stress is laid, falls to the ground. Zosimus quoted Canon vii. of Sardica,[457] in order to show that he did not intend to act in the case of Apiarius according to his extraordinary jurisdiction, *ex plenitudine potestatis,* but according to the ordinary discipline of the Universal Church. He therefore did not himself pronounce sentence in the matter, but was content with appointing new judges in Africa, and sent his legates thither in accordance with

[456] *Commonitorium Zosimi Papæ ad Legatos* (Coustant, p. 981, seq.).

[457] Zosimus quotes in his *Commonitorium* the Canons of Sardica as if they belonged to Nicæa, because in all the old manuscripts they are found with the Acts of the Nicene Synod without any distinct title: so that not only Zosimus and Boniface, but also St. Jerome, Innocent I., St. Leo, &c., called them Nicene Canons. The old codices, which still exist, contain the Canons of Sardica with the Acts of Nicæa, without any distinction whatever. (Coustant., *Epist. RR. PP.*, p. lxxvii., n. 84. Ballerini: *De Antiq. Collect. Can.*, pt. ii., c. i., sec. iii., n. 19, in Op. S. Leonis, t. iii., p. lxii. Marchetti: Op. cit., pt. ii., sec. v., n. 62, p. 228, seq.) Had the Popes known for certain that these canons belonged to the Council of Sardica, they would have made the fact known to the African Church, since this Church expressed its readiness to conform to them had they been decreed by any Catholic Council.—See Ballerini's *Observ. in Dissert.* v. *Quesnellii*, pt. i., c. vi., n. xx. (in Op. S. Leonis, t. ii., p. 955).

the discipline mentioned in the Council of Sardica. He moreover quoted Canon xvii. of the same synod, with the same purpose of showing that, according to the discipline then in vigour, any of the inferior clergy, after condemnation by his bishop, had a right to have his cause reheard by a tribunal of the second instance. The object of the Pope in this quotation was to show that he had acted in harmony with the canons of the Church when he resolved to commit Apiarius, a simple priest, to the judgment of a second tribunal of bishops. In this manner the Vicar of Christ manifested those feelings of moderation, of humility, and of meekness, of which Christ Himself set so perfect an example. Nevertheless, Zosimus did not in any degree lower his supreme authority, nor were the African bishops tempted by the Pope's forbearance to diminish in any degree their respectful submission to the Pontiff. The address of the bishops assembled at Milevis had already shown what were their sentiments with regard to the supremacy of the Apostolic See ;[458] and even in the matter before us, as has been remarked above, they gave proof of their respect and obedience to the supreme jurisdiction, which, not long before, Zosimus himself had authoritatively claimed in the controversy of Celestine.[459] It is true that in the council held at Carthage in 419, the inferior clergy were forbidden, under pain of excommunication, to appeal to Rome ; but we must remark first, that in the same canon the African bishops decreed that from that time forth priests and deacons could have a first and second appeal from the sentence of their bishops to the provincial synod, and again to the

[458] *Epist. Milevit. Conc. ad Innocentium I.* (Coustant., p. 873, seq.).

[459] S. Zosimus : *Epist.* xii., *ad Synod. Carthag.*, n. 1. (Coustant., p. 974).

general synod of Africa ; and that they introduced this change into their ancient discipline in order to render it conformable with the Seventeenth Canon of Sardica mentioned in the *Commonitorium* of Pope Zosimus. Secondly, neither Pope Zosimus nor his successor, Boniface, ever condemned or rescinded the African discipline which forbade the African clergy to appeal to Rome. We cannot then wonder if the African bishops, after having made great concessions to the inferior clergy, and put them, with regard to appeals, on a level with the bishops themselves, thus enforced and sanctioned their ancient discipline, more especially since civil and ecclesiastical law have alike ever condemned appeals which do not keep the order established by the law. In a word, the African controversy concerning appeals has nothing to do with the acknowledged supremacy of the Pope and his right to receive appeals as a supreme judge appointed by God over the whole Church. It must be considered as having a double bearing. The African bishops on the one hand were anxious to prevent abuses, and to check the audacity, deceit, and scandalous excesses of guilty clerics, who endeavoured to set at naught the authority of the laws of the Church, by obtaining at Rome, through unlawful means, an undeserved protection. On the other hand, the African synod in the above-mentioned canon forbade nothing but the formal and judicial appeal of the inferior clergy to the See of Rome ; it did not, and it could not, forbid their private recourse to the supreme pastor of the Church ; and if, under any exceptional circumstances, the Pope saw fit, he might suspend the effect of the general canon, and enable the condemned priest or deacon to lay a formal and judicial appeal before his court. From all this we conclude that neither the Canons of Sardica, nor the controversy about appeals carried on for five years in

Africa, can impeach either the acknowledged divine supremacy of the Pope, or his right to receive appeals as the supreme judge over the Universal Church.

VI. But other difficulties remain to be considered, which have been brought forward in order to weaken the argument which we derive from the right of appeal in favour of our position. We will again quote from Dr. Pusey: "Heretics," he says, "or bad men excommunicated in their own country, betook themselves to Rome, where their merits were not known; as, contrariwise, Pelagius, condemned in the West, betook himself to the East."[460] Assume that the fact is so. If bad men like Marcion, and good men, like St. Athanasius, appealed to Rome, it is clear that the Apostolic See had a right to judge anew, and to reverse, if faulty, the sentence by which they had been condemned. If, on the other hand, bad men condemned in the West betook themselves to the East, this does not prove that the East had any authority of reversing sentences pronounced against a criminal by an ecclesiastical tribunal in the West. Throughout Church history, no single instance could be found of an appeal carried to an Eastern synod, provincial or general, or to any of the Oriental Patriarchs, from a sentence of a Western synod under the sanction of a Pope. But innumerable examples occur of persons who, after condemnation in the East, appealed to the Papal court, and of this sufficient proof has been given in the two preceding sections. It is true that bad men, who had been condemned in the West, often betook themselves to the East, in order there to do the mischief which the notoriety of their true character rendered impossible elsewhere. Such a one was Pelagius; he defended his errors in the synods both of Jerusalem and of Diospolis, but he appeared

[460] *Eirenicon*, p. 73.

before these assemblies as a criminal—his accusers being, in the former, Orosius, in the latter, Eros and Lazarus, two bishops of Gaul.[461] But Dr. Pusey continues, "The case of Basilides and Martialis is more interesting, because the people and the clergy of Astorga, Merida, and Leon, *had appealed* to St. Cyprian, who, assembling thirty-seven other bishops, in a synodical letter judged that the deposition of Basilides and Martialis was right; the election of Felix and Sabinus, of which an account had been sent, was canonical," &c.[462] What conclusion is meant to be drawn from this? Is it that the Pope had no right to receive appeals before the grant to him of that privilege by the Council of Sardica, or that St. Cyprian was an advocate of the Protestant doctrine, and denied the right of the Pope to judge all causes, wherever they might arise? Why, the very fact of the appeal of Basilides and Martialis to the Apostolic See, and the judgment pronounced by Pope Stephen in their case, is an evident proof that the right of the Pontiff to receive appeals was practically acknowledged by the Universal Church. Nor can it be said that St. Cyprian denied that Papal prerogative, for neither from his Sixty-eighth Epistle, nor from any other place in his writings, can a single word be cited which implies a charge against the Roman Pontiff of usurping episcopal rights. Moreover, in the Fifty-fifth Epistle, he acknowledges the right of the Apostolic See to receive the appeal of Privatus Lambesitanus, a bishop who had been condemned by the two African synods.[463] If, in the same letter, he seems to speak somewhat

[461] Marius Mercator, editus a Garnerio, S.J.: *Diss.* ii. *de Synodis habitis in causa Pelagiana*, t. i., p. 165, seq., p. 169, seq. Parisiis, 1673.

[462] *Eirenicon*, p. 75.

[463] P. 84. Edit. Balutii. *Ibid.*, *Epist.* xxx., *Cleri Rom. ad S. Cyprianum*, p. 41.

harshly of appeals to Rome, he is not considering appeals of bishops, but those of simple priests, such as Fortunatus and Felicissimus, to whom the African discipline did not allow recourse to Rome. St. Cyprian, when explaining and justifying this discipline, does not deny to the Pope the supreme power *ex plenitudine potestatis*.[464] Neither is this the only case in which, while St. Cyprian was Primate of Carthage, appeals of bishops were carried to Rome. He mentions the appeal of Bishop Novatus, and when stating the crimes by which he incurred condemnation by the bishops of Africa, he does not at all deny the right of appealing,[465] declaring that all causes of great importance (*causæ majores*) should be referred to the Papal tribunal.[466] Nay, St. Cyprian himself applied to Pope Stephen to transfer the cause of Marcianus, Bishop of Arles, guilty of Novatianism, to his own tribunal, and to condemn and deprive him of his see, in order that they might proceed to elect another bishop in his stead.[467] De Marca, whose authority is so highly appreciated by Protestant writers, remarks, on this point: "In vain do Protestants endeavour to make little of this testimony, for it is futile to say that Marcianus was not deposed by Stephen, but only declared worthy to be deposed. St. Cyprian plainly requires of Stephen, in

[464] L. c., p. 86. In this letter St. Cyprian gives two reasons for which that discipline had been established in Africa for the inferior clergy. (1.) "Oportet eos quibus præsumus non circumcursare." (2.) "Nec episcoporum concordiam cohærentem subdola et fallaci temeritate collidere." Such were the faults of the inferior African clergy, which that discipline intended to obviate.—See Lupus: *De Africanæ Ecclesiæ Appellationibus*, c. xvii., Op., t. viii., p. 220.

[465] S. Cyprianus: *Epist.* xlix., *ad Cornelium*, p. 64. Edit. Balut.

[466] *Ibid.*, *Epist.* lv., *ad Cornelium*, p. 83.

[467] *Ibid.*, *Epist.* lxvii., *ad Stephanum Papam*, p. 116. "Dirigantur in provinciam et ad plebem Arelate consistentem a te litteræ quibus, abstento Marciano, alius in loco ejus substituatur," &c.

the most explicit manner, to condemn Marcianus by his letters, and let another be appointed to his see.[468]

VII. But, on the other hand, it is absurd to say that the people and the clergy of Astorga *appealed* to St. Cyprian. According to the theory put forward by Dr. Pusey, all bishops are equal; so that each diocese is a perfectly independent church, and is to act on the principle of episcopal independence. Now it cannot be denied that appeal is a recourse from a sentence of an inferior to a superior judge; a *minore judice ad majorem provocatio*, say the jurists. How then, on the theory just mentioned, could the people and clergy of Astorga appeal to St. Cyprian from the sentence of Pope Stephen? Even if Stephen were not the supreme pastor of the whole Church, he was undoubtedly the Patriarch of the West, and hence had, in virtue even of that dignity, the right of judging in the last instance. He was at least a bishop, and as Dr. Pusey would grant, in no respect inferior to St. Cyprian. How, then, could an appeal be made from his sentence to the tribunal of an African bishop? But we need not dwell on this discussion, when the very letter of St. Cyprian to the clergy and people of Spain plainly tells us what was the nature of their application to the Bishop of Carthage. "As soon as we assembled," writes St. Cyprian and the other bishops with him, "we read your letters . . . in which you inform us that Basilides and Martialis, being found guilty of the charges of idolatry and other nefarious crimes, ought not to preserve their episcopal dignity and the administration of the divine priesthood. And you wish that we should answer your question, that your just and necessary anxiety might be allayed by the consolation or the help of our opinion." They continue: "But, better than our advice, the divine

[468] De Marca: *De Concordia*, l. i., c. x., n. viii., p. 42.

precepts will satisfy your desires."[469] Now, who does not see that the clergy of Spain, and, in an especial manner, the two bishops newly consecrated in the place of Basilides and Martialis, merely sought advice in addressing themselves to the Primate of Africa. They propose to him a case of conscience and of Canon Law. They wish to know whether the election and consecration of Felix and Sabinus, after the deposition of Basilides and Martialis, had been canonical and valid; whether the deceit and fraud used at Rome by Basilides and Martialis could have the effect of invalidating the lawful and canonical election and consecration of the two newly-appointed bishops. The synod assembled by St. Cyprian examined the proposed question, and gave an opinion thereon. This has nothing to do with formal appeals.

VIII. Finally, Dr. Pusey, following in the footsteps of De Marca,[470] gives the name *relations* to what all antiquity calls *appeals;* and he remarks that, "These, in the times nearest to the Apostles, were very different from those which the Church of England laid aside."[471] In the times nearest to the Apostles, the head of the Church, the Roman Pontiff, had the same authority, the same jurisdiction, as in the fifth or in the sixteenth century, because his authority and his jurisdiction are of divine origin. But the form in which he exercised this jurisdiction in ecclesiastical judgments was not always the same, for it varied according to the requirements of the discipline of successive centuries, and of the divers needs of the Church and particular provinces. Dr. Pusey first confounds substance with accident, and then, with no less inconsistency, concludes

[469] S. Cyprianus: *Epist.* lxviii., p. 117.
[470] De Marca: Op. cit., l. i., c. x., n. 2, seq., p. 37, seq.
[471] *Eirenicon*, p. 76.

that the English Church, in the sixteenth century, did more than the African in the fifth. We have seen how this author has misconceived and misrepresented the African controversy concerning appeals to Rome. The African Church did not complain in the fifth century, more than in the fourth, of the supreme authority of the Pope, nor of Roman appeals; it merely protested in favour of an old provincial custom, which no law, either of Popes or of general councils, had ever repealed. The English Church, in the sixteenth century, rejected Roman appeals because it refused to acknowledge the divine supremacy of the Apostolic See.

SECTION VII.

GALLICANISM: ITS ORIGIN, ITS PROGRESS, ITS TENDENCY AND EFFECTS.

I. DR. PUSEY and Protestants in general show great sympathy for the Gallican Church of the time of Louis XIV. They appeal to the writers of that country and period as to infallible oracles; eulogize their works as treasures of erudition, and draw upon them as storehouses for charges against the Catholic Church. Du Pin, Fleury, and the author of the *Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, are, in the eyes of Protestants, great names before whom all must bow. The Gallican system seems to them the pure system established by the Apostles before the Papal usurpations; and they are indignant at those who dare to assert that Galli-

canism is now extinct in France. Dr. Pusey throughout his *Eirenicon* expresses sentiments such as these, and goes so far as to say that he would rest his principles on the Gallican system; that the Church of Du Pin would have been able to restore communion on the basis of the explanation appended to the Articles of Lambeth, "had not the ascendancy of the Jesuits quenched the hope of the restoration of the union;"[472] that "he would long to see the Church united on the terms which," as he fancies, "Bossuet would have sanctioned."[473] In writing this, Dr. Pusey has fallen into three palpable mistakes. First, he seems to believe that the Gallican Church and its principal writers agree with him on the essential question of Papal authority. Secondly, he represents the Gallican system as a source of liberty and independence for the episcopacy. Thirdly, he thinks that the Gallican doctrines were those of the early Church, not only in France, but also in the whole world. These three points once explained, no ground will remain for imagining that the Gallican system gives any countenance to the opinions of Protestants.

II. First, the Gallican school, in all its phases, has ever professed to believe that the Papal supremacy was of divine institution; that the Pope is not only the first in order among the bishops, but that he has also a real jurisdiction over the whole Church, and is the centre of unity in the Church; that he can exercise a coercive power in order to enforce this jurisdiction; and, finally, that communion with the Pope is equivalent to communion with the Church, and is, therefore, necessary to salvation. We challenge our adversaries to point out a single theologian of the Gallican school, even of the times of Louis XIV. or his successor, who does not explicitly maintain these doctrines, which are essential

[472] *Eirenicon*, p. 236. [473] *Ibid.*, p. 335.

to Catholic communion, and as such, plainly professed in the famous Articles of the Gallican Church. Hence, Du Pin was suspected of Protestant principles; and on this account strongly opposed by Bossuet,[474] severely censured by Pope Clement XI., and obliged by Harley, Archbishop of Paris,[475] to make a solemn recantation of his errors against the Apostolic See. Du Pin did not belong to the Gallican so much as to the Jansenistic school in France: he was a Jansenist at heart, and in the opinion of many, a Protestant. Certainly his *Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles*, offered to the Anglican Establishment in the person of Archbishop Wake, did not originate, as Dr. Pusey asserts,[476] from "the Roman side," but from a Jansenistic plot, in which Du Pin was the principal agent. Hence the *Commonitorium* of Du Pin cannot be supposed to represent the mind of the moderate Gallicans of 1719, as Dr. Pusey imagines it to do.[477] The moderate members of the party at that date followed the example of Bossuet in condemning the audacious maxims put forth by Du Pin against the supremacy of the Pope, which they ever maintained according to the principles of the Catholic Church. We have already remarked that the Assembly of 1682 itself, in the first of the well-known Four Articles, affirmed the divine supremacy of the Roman Pontiff. We do not, however, deny that Gallicanism, considered in its natural tendency, is truly a schism in disguise. Its real nature was sufficiently revealed by Febronius, the disciple of Van Espen, by whom its genuine principles were developed and propagated: but we must distinguish the historical from the logical

[474] See the first section of this book, n. iv., p. 16.

[475] Feller: *Dict. Hist. Art. Du Pin*, t. xiii., p. 431. Paris, 1827—29.

[476] *Eirenicon*, p. 210.

[477] *Ibid.*, p. 212.

question. Gallicanism, historically considered, was an offshoot of Protestantism, and the well-spring of Febronianism. This is the reason of the sympathy evinced for it by Dr. Pusey and Protestants generally. But Gallicanism, regarded logically, did not assert an entire independence of the Holy See, nor did it leave to the Pope merely the empty title of Head of the Church, without jurisdiction.[478] Hence the Gallican Church was never cut off from Catholic communion, nor condemned by any formal judgment of the Apostolic See as guilty of heresy or of schism. An historical sketch of the origin, progress, and development of the Gallican system will put this question in a new light, and will show plainly whether the system was the support of the ecclesiastical liberty of France, or rather the source of its servitude and depression.

III. Long before the pretended Council of Basle the seeds of schism and rebellion against the supreme authority of the Church had spread over Europe. Many causes concurred in fostering this evil tendency and widening its effects; among which causes no little influence must be ascribed to the revival of the Roman jurisprudence. The new jurisconsults, inspired with the pagan maxims of imperial autocracy, regarded the jurisdiction of the Holy See as an unlawful usurpation of the rights of the civil authority. By exaggerated doctrines regarding the prerogatives of princes and Emperors, these lawyers created a jealousy of Papal authority. In the name of the independence and power of princes, they declared the bitterest war against the jurisdiction of the Apostolic See, and drove temporal rulers into a

[478] Héricourt: *Les Loix Ecclésiastiques de France*, pt. i., c. xvii., p. 115. Paris, 1721. M. Héricourt protests against those who "font consister nos libertés dans une indépendance entière du Saint Siége, laissant au Pape un vain titre de chef de l'Eglise sans aucune jurisdiction."

miserable struggle with the supreme pastor of the Church. Such was the source whence sprang the wicked attempts of Philip the Fair, King of France, against Boniface VIII., and of Louis of Bavaria, the pretender to the imperial crown, against John XXII. But the long residence of the Popes at Avignon, followed, after their return to Rome, by the Western schism, caused these schismatical principles to spread far and wide, and to strike deep root in Europe. The Papal authority at this time was everywhere disparaged and vilified. The competitors for the Popedom clung to princes for support, and these sold their protection at a very dear price.

IV. But whilst the Western Church was rent by schism, whilst the Pontifical authority was ever sinking lower and lower, through the contention of parties and the rivalry of aspirants to the Papal Chair, and a licentious freedom was spreading far and wide, a common earnest desire grew gradually among the different factions to put an end to the unhappy state of things and to restore to the Church its unity, discipline, and order. But disappointment in the past and despair of success in the future, caused a new division among those who entertained this wish, as to the means best adapted for attaining the intended purpose. Two parties sprang up among the theologians of that age. The first was disposed to carry on the work of reformation by using violence against the contending Popes, and, ready even to cast off the yoke of central authority in favour of the institution of national and independent churches, aimed at effecting a radical revolution in the Church, at originating a movement which, once on foot, would have infallibly led to a formal schism. Such a movement had already been initiated in the fourteenth century by the factions of Philip the Fair and Louis of Bavaria, both of whom had sought to put arbitrary

limits to Papal authority. We find the seeds of their schismatical principles more or less developed in the works of Occam,[479] Ægidius de Columna,[480] John of Paris,[481] and especially of John of Janduno,[482] and Marsilius of Padua.[483] But side by side with this reckless party stood a more moderate one, headed by D'Ailly,[484] Gerson,[485] Nicholas Cusa,[486] John Major,[487] James Almain,[488] and Nicholas of Clemangis himself.[489] These held fast, indeed, to the essential necessity of unity in the Church, and of communion with the Apostolic See; they acknowledged the divine supremacy of the Pope as identical with the essence of Christianity itself, but they lowered the divine authority of that sovereign head, subordinating it to the power of the one Universal

[479] Occam: *Dialogus* (Goldasti Monarchia, t. ii.); *Octo Quaestiones* (*ibid*).

[480] Ægidius of Colonna: *Quæstio in utramque partem disputatam de Potestate Regia et Pontificia* (Goldasti Mon., t. ii.).

[481] John of Paris: *De Potestate Regia et Papali* (Goldasti Monar., t. ii.).

[482] John of Janduno helped Marsilius of Padua in his work, *Defensor Pacis*. He himself wrote a book, *De Potestate Ecclesiastica* (in MS. Bibl., Colbert., cod. 506).

[483] Marsilius of Padua: *Defensor Pacis; De Translatione Imperii* (Goldasti Monarchia, t. ii.).

[484] Petrus de Alliaco: *De necessitate reformationis Ecclesiæ in capite et in membris* (in Op. Gersonis, t. ii., p. 885, seq. Edit. Du Pin).

[485] Gerson: Opera, t. ii., p. 246, *De Potestate Ecclesiastica*, consid. xii., &c. Likewise in other works, such as the *De auferibilitate Papæ ab Ecclesia; De Modis uniendi et reformandi Ecclesiam in Concilio Universali*, &c.

[486] Nicholaus Cusanus: *De Concordia Catholica libri tres* (Op., t. ii. Edit. Basileæ).

[487] Joannes Major: *Comment. in lib. Sent.*, l. iv., dist. xxiv. (in Gersonis Op., t. ii., p. 1121).

[488] Jac. Almainus: *Expositio circa decisiones M. Guil. Occam super Potestate R. Pontif.* (in Gersonis Op., t. ii., p. 243).

[489] Nicholaus de Clemangis: *De Ruina Ecclesiæ.*

Church, which they put forward as the highest fulfilment of the economy of Christ. Consequently, the authority of single bishops was magnified more than was fit, the independence of single national churches was proclaimed, and Popes were subjected to the control of general councils. This party, in their desire to heal the unhappy schism, saw no other means to attain that end but to establish as a general theory for the normal state of the Church, what was adapted only to the particular and transitory state of schism. Their idea was that the episcopate assembled in a general council could alone do away with the schism ; but how assemble a general council, when its convocation needed the concurrence of both the competitors for the Papal Chair, and each of them, Peter de Luna especially, showed himself disinclined to take part in such a proceeding. Even if the two parties had agreed in convoking a council, would they submit to its decrees concerning either the union or the reformation of the Church? In these circumstances, the more moderate theologians believed that no theory could save the Church but one which set up general councils in independence of the control of the Pope and in supremacy over his authority. Principles such as these were therefore spread and supported in Europe by the authority of Gerson, D'Ailly, and others. They formed the characteristic of a party which strove hard for preponderance in the University of Paris. But, at the same time, the greater number of theologians held fast to the traditional doctrines of the Church, and strongly opposed the promoters of the new monarchico-aristocratic system of Church government. In France, the free spirit which spread in the University of Paris was opposed and condemned by the principles upheld by the University of Toulouse ; but among the writers who at that time defended Pontifical authority, the first place must be

assigned to Cajetan[490] and Cardinal Turrecremata.[491] The works of these writers throw light on the controversies which were rife at that period concerning Papal authority.

V. But the French faction of Gerson, after its bold appearance in the Synod of Pisa and Constance, would have been held in check and entirely forgotten, even in France, after the election of Martin V. and the reunion of the Western Church, had it not been again called to life and vigour by the despotism of the Parliaments of France. For, as Gieseler himself remarks, "The feeble light of the Council of Constance grew pale before the new splendour of the new Pope, the first, for a long time, who had been universally acknowledged; and the Papal monarchy immediately raised itself again, without opposition, above all the limits which the ecclesiastical aristocracy meant to have imposed."[492] Every country in Europe rejected and condemned the system of the University of Paris. Italy, Spain, and Portugal, had always remained faithful to the principles of the constitution of the Church, and they now adhered to the Pope more closely than ever. Germany and England had accepted the *Concordats* offered to them by Martin V. in the Council of Constance.[493] The French Parliament alone resisted the general tendency

[490] Cajetanus: *De Comparatione Auctoritatis Papæ et Concilii; De Comparata Auctoritate Papæ et Concilii Apologiæ.* 1511 et 1521.

[491] Card. Turrecremata: *Summa de Ecclesia et ejus auctoritate* (Lugd., 1496—Venet., 1561); *Summi Pontificis et Concilii Auctoritas* (in Actis Conc. Labbe, t. xvii., p. 1427).

[492] Gieseler: *Eccl. Hist.*, vol. iv., div. v., ch. i., sec. 131, p. 301. Edinburgh.

[493] *Martini V. et Nationis Germanicæ Concordata* (in Sess. xlii. Conc. Const. Labbe, t. xvi., p. 735); *Martini V. et Nationis Anglicanæ Concordata* (*ibid*, p. 739).

of Europe towards order and unity, and submitted to the sway of schismatical principles. They refused to accept the *Concordat* offered at the Council of Constance to the French nation and accepted by its bishops,[494] and when King Charles VII. attempted (1419) to repeal some ordinances enacted the year before, in prejudice of the discipline of the Church, they rendered the royal edict void, and enforced their decrees.[495] Charles VII. was truly desirous to show his devotion to Papal authority; he therefore, at a later period, published (February 4, 1424) a royal edict, in which he ordered obedience to the decrees of the Apostolic See, notwithstanding any contrary order or decree published either by the King or by the Parliament.[496] He was, nevertheless, entangled in the system of parliamentary routine; nor could he succeed in breaking asunder the bonds of that crafty administration. At the same time, the reformatory decrees published by the Council of Basle after its final breach with Pope Eugenius IV. impelled the King into a course of opposition to the Apostolic See, which proved highly favourable to the schismatical tendency of that age. Charles VII. was no doubt sincerely averse to the course of open hostility to Rome adopted by the assembly of Basle, and he was very far from approving the insulting decrees enacted against the Pope. Nevertheless, the interest of securing to his national Church the liberties decreed at Basle, persuaded him to assemble the bishops of France at Bourges and to sanction twenty-three of the decrees of Basle, under the title of the Pragmatic Sanction (1438); the

[494] *Constitutiones factæ in Conc. Const. non acceptatæ in Curia Parliamenti regii Parisiensis* (Labbe, l. c., p. 729).

[495] Bulaeus: *Hist. Univ. Paris.*, t. v., p. 335; *Preuves de l'Eglise Gallicane*, c. xxii., n. 17.

[496] The royal edict is dated Febr. 10, 1425.

Parliament of Paris registered this measure on the 13th July, 1439.[497] Such is the real origin of the Gallican liberties.[498] Martin V. was ready to redress every abuse which, during the schism, had crept into the exercise of Papal authority with regard to annates, reservations of benefices, and appeals, and in the Concordat agreed to at Constance, regulations and modifications respecting these points had found a place. But no Pope could ever have tolerated that a synod which had proclaimed its authority supreme in the Church and superior to that of the Pope, should curtail the rights of the Holy See and excite a new schism in the Catholic world. Now the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges was grounded on the false maxims of Basle, and partook of the schismatical tendency of that council.[499] The Popes, therefore, being ever decidedly opposed to the proceedings of Basle, strongly disapproved of the Pragmatic Sanction. Eugenius IV., Pius II., Sixtus IV., Innocent VIII., Alexander VI., Julius II., successively tried by every means in their power to have it erased from the laws of the French nation. Under Pius II., Louis XI. King of France, in 1461, repealed the measure.[500] At length, in the Fifth Council of Lateran, under Leo X., the repeal was confirmed by a clause of the Concordat then agreed upon between the Pope

[497] The history of the *Pragmatic Sanction* can be found in the *Traités des droits et libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane.* Paris, 1731.—See Rohrbacher's *Hist. Univ. de l'Eglise Cath.*, t. xxi., l. 82, pp. 585—87. Paris, 1845.

[498] See Charlas: *Tract. de lib. Eccl. Gall.*, l. i., c. xvi., p. 48, seq. Leodii, 1684.

[499] See the first title of the *Pragm. Sanction.*

[500] *Litteræ Ludovici XI. Regis Galliæ abrogationis Pragm. Sanct.* (Labbe, t. xix., p. 749); *Monitorium contra Pragmat. Sanct.* (*ibid.*, p. 750, seq.); *Bulla contra Pragmat.* (*ibid.*, p. 753).—See also other documents in Labbe, t. xviii., pp. 1370-71.

and Francis I. of France, which continued in force till the revolution of 1789.[501]

VI. But notwithstanding the abrogation of the Pragmatic Sanction ordered by Louis XI., and its final abolition decreed by Francis I., the maxims from which it had emanated did not lose currency, but continued with obstinate persistence to be the guiding principle of the Parliaments of France, and especially of the Parliament of Paris, which, in the fifteenth century had acquired no small political importance. This assembly had insensibly gained more decided authority by its control over what was at first the formality of promulgating or enregistering the royal ordinances. That formality soon came to be considered essential to the validity and legal force of the royal edicts, and increasing power and influence soon enabled this body to refuse to the pronouncements of the royal will the character of legal enactments.[502] When Louis XI. repealed the Pragmatic Sanction which his father had signed, the Parliament most obstinately opposed the measure; and though ultimately it yielded this point, yet it never ceased to maintain that hostile attitude towards Papal authority which, originating in the schismatical principles of the fifteenth century, increased in strength with the spread of Calvinistic errors. It strove therefore, by every means, to ensure in France the triumph of the new schismatical maxims; and for this purpose it gave countenance to the revolutionary party of the University of Paris, as a check upon the preponderating doctrine of the absolute supremacy of the Apostolic See; and it even went so

[501] *Bulla abrogationis Pragm. Sanct.* In Sess. xi. Conc. Lat. v. (Labbe, t. xix., p. 965, seq.).

[502] Hallam: *State of Europe during the Middle Ages*, vol. i., c. i., pt. ii., p. 289, seq. London, 1834.

far as to pass a censure upon and condemn certain principles which seemed favourable to the Catholic view of Papal authority.[503] But one of the most disastrous results of the Pragmatic Sanction is the appeal *ex abusu* to the civil tribunals against the sentence of ecclesiastical judges. The Parliaments of France, nurtured in those pagan views of authority which had already spread throughout Europe, not content with placing themselves on the same level with the ecclesiastical power, even claimed to be superior to it. The orders of Charles II., the abrogation of the Pragmatic Sanction, the bulls published by Sixtus IV. and Julius II.,[504] and, finally, the Concordat concluded between Leo X. and Francis I., were alike ineffectual in restraining, or even in setting limits to their arbitrary encroachments.[505] Nay, the ordinance published by Francis I. upon the subject had the effect of inspiring the Parliaments with greater obstinacy in their despotic usurpations of the rights of the Church; for in the ordinance of the King the appeal *ex abusu* was treated as an integral part of the royal prerogative.[506] These tyrannical abuses were maintained in France, in spite of the complaints and resistance of the national clergy;[507] and they were scarcely restrained

[503] See D'Argentré: *Collectio Judiciorum de Novis Erroribus*, t. i., pt. ii., pp. 227, 240, 305.

[504] *Bulla Sixti IV. pro Libertate Clericorum* (Labbe, t. xix., p. 377); *Bulla Julii II. contra Pragm. Sanct.* (Labbe, l. c., p. 753).

[505] Charlas: Op. cit., l. xii., capp. i.—viii., pp. 754—788. Affre: *De l'Appel comme d'abus*, pp. 174, seq., 178, &c. "Les rois," says Mgr. Affre, "après avoir dominé le clergé dans les élections, essaient de l' asservir par les Concordats; ces traités, en les rendant maîtres du choix des chefs, les rendaient maîtres du corps entier," &c.—See Sfondrati: *Gallia Vindicata*, diss. iii., sec. ii., n. 4, p. 590. Edit. 1702.

[506] Héricourt: Op. cit., pt. i., c. xix., n. iv., p. 127; c. xxv., n. xxxiii., p. 206.

[507] Charlas: Op. cit., l. xii., c. v., n. 11, p. 773; c. vi., p. 779.

by the indomitable will of Louis XIV. After the death of this monarch, they reappeared under the patronage of the Jansenist party.[508] And we have seen in our own day that the new empire of France still clings to the appeal *ex abusu*, as if it were a precious and inalienable jewel of the imperial diadem. The pretext set forth in order to maintain this state of things was the necessity of upholding the liberties of the Gallican Church and of remaining faithful to the ancient canons. But in reality, the lawyers intended to degrade the Church and to render it the slave of the civil authority;[509] and Calvinism and paganism banded together to accomplish the purpose of despotic oppression. To render success more secure, care was taken to flatter the national vanity, and to enlist this passion as an auxiliary in the work. With this view, treatises on the liberties of the Gallican Church were composed by the lawyer Guy Coquille,[510] and by Peter Pithou, a jurisconsult of Calvinistic principles, the latter of whom dedicated his work to the King of France. The treatise assumes throughout the two following principles: first, that in the temporal order the Popes have no jurisdiction whatever, either general or particular, in the kingdom of France; and secondly, that the Papal authority is limited in its exercise by the canons of such councils of the Church as had been received in France. Hence Pithou concluded that the Popes could not interfere with the Gallican liberties, which rested on the ancient

[508] Phillips: *Droit Ecclésiastique*, vol. iii., sec. cxxxv., p. 207, seq. Paris, 1851.

[509] Charlas was right when he defined the Gallican liberties—"Oppressionem jurisdictionis ecclesiasticæ a laica et depressionem auctoritatis Rom. Pontif. a clero Gallicano."—Op. cit., l. i., c. xiii., n. 6, p. 39.

[510] Guy Coquille: *Traités des libertés l'Eglise Gallicane.* 1594. P. Pithou: *Traités des droits et libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane.* 1609.

canons of the Church; and thus the authority of the Pope was subordinated to that of the canons and of the councils, while the authority of the canons and of the councils themselves was made subordinate to that of the Parliaments and lawyers. For Pithou and his school did not admit absolutely the authority of canons and councils, but of those only which had the sanction of the Parliaments. The right of giving or refusing their sanction had been claimed by these judicial bodies, and, on this account, even before the publication of Pithou's treatise, the Parliaments had been persistent in refusing to receive the decrees of the Council of Trent, because they did not find them favourable to the Gallican liberties. Hence Charlas is fully justified when he defines the Gallican liberties, "An arbitrary power to select among the ancient canons of the Church, and to admit from the new ones only those which seem to be useful."[511]

VII. Dupuy, a jurisconsult of the same school with Pithou, followed in his master's footsteps, and published a collection of historical documents in defence of his work.[512] Dupuy, no less than Pithou, was an organ of the Parliaments of France, and both these writers proclaimed the systematic slavery of the clergy under the specious pretext of the Gallican liberties. The episcopate of France protested against illusory privileges which implied a real servitude, and condemned the book of Dupuy as containing poisonous and heretical principles concerning the authority of the Church.[513] But the maxims of paganism, spread and upheld by the Parliaments, had already infected the royal councils

[511] Charlas: Op. cit., l. c., n. 7, p. 39.

[513] *Procès-verbaux du Clergé de France*, t. iii., n. 1. See Soardi: *De Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ Sententia de R. Pontif. auctoritate*, l. iv., c. iv., pt. ii., p. 137, seq. Heildelbergæ, 1793.

[512] Dupuy: *Preuves des libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane.* 1639.

and placed them under the control of lawyers half heretics and half infidels. The Parliament of Paris and the King united together in favour of the principles of ecclesiastical oppression. The Eighty-three Articles of Pithou were regarded as inviolable principles under the palladium of France. On the contrary, the sentence of the episcopate was censured and cancelled by the Parliament; and the book of Dupuy reappeared, decorated with a royal patent and a splendid encomium.[514] Thus all the lawyers in France were encouraged to draw from the works of Pithou and Dupuy maxims most hostile to the Apostolic See. Richer, Fevret, Launoy, Ellis, Du Pin, Richard Simon, were formed in this school, to which Fleury himself belongs, who, having begun life in the robe of a lawyer, put on the ecclesiastical soutane, without renouncing maxims he had learnt in the Parliament of Paris. With such support, the Parliament shook off all restraint, and went boldly forward in the path of schism. The magistrates of the Parliament, in the words of the Count de Maistre, "Régentêrent les Evêques; ils saisirent leur temporel. . . . Pour détruire un ordre célèbre, ils s'appuyèrent d'un livre qu'ils avaient fait fabriquer eux-mêmes, et dont les auteurs eussent été condamnés aux galères sans difficulté dans tout pays où les juges n'auraient pas été complices. Ils firent brûler des mandements d' Evêques, et même, si l'on ne m'a pas trompé, des bulles du Pape, par la main du bourreau. Ils finirent par violer les tabernacles et en arracher l'eucharistie, pour l'envoyer au milieu de quatre baïonettes, chez le malade obstiné qui ne pouvant la recevoir, avait la coupable audace de se la faire adjuger."[515] In a

[514] See the edition of that work. Paris, 1651. 2 tom. in folio.

[515] De Maistre: *De l'Eglise Gallicane*, l. i., c. ii., pp. 118-19. Bruxelles, 1838.

word, the Gallican liberties, in which Dr. Pusey and his friends take such interest, were, to use again the words of the author just quoted, "Licence parlementaire envers l'Eglise qui agréait insensiblement l'esclavage avec la permission de l'appeller liberté."[516] It might, perhaps, have been anticipated that Count de Maistre would pronounce such a sentence on the Gallican liberties; but we find that Fleury himself, towards the end of his life, expressed a like appreciation of them. In his *Opuscules* he speaks as follows: "La grande servitude de l'Eglise Gallicane, c'est l'étendue excessive de la jurisdiction temporelle. . . . On pourrait faire un traité des servitudes de l'Eglise Gallicane, comme on en a fait des libertés; et l'on ne manquerait point de preuves. . . . Les appellations comme d' abus ont achevé de ruiner la jurisdiction ecclésiastique."[517] And Fénélon, that illustrious ornament of the French clergy, spoke of the Gallican liberties as, "Libertés à l'égard du Pape; servitude à l'égard du Roi. Autorité du Roi sur l'Eglise dévolue aux juges laïques. Les laïques dominent les Evêques; . . . examinent les Bulles sur la Foi . . . jugent le tout."[518] Dr. Pusey accuses the successive governments since the Restoration of 1815 of being alone in oppressing the Church.[519] But, in truth, the oppression of the Church in France dates from the introduction of the Gallican liberties, which are nothing else than systematic oppression.

VIII. At the same time, it cannot be denied that after the Church of France had been labouring for two centuries under the arbitrary despotism of the Parlia-

[516] De Maistre: Op. cit., l. ii., c. xlv., p. 352.

[517] Fleury: *Sur les libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane*, pp. 80, 95, 97. Paris, 1807.

[518] *Mémoires de Fénélon dans son Hist. par Bausset*, t. iii. Pièces justif. du liv. vii., n. viii., p. 496. Paris, 1809.

[519] *Eirenicon*, Postscriptum, p. 288.

ments and of the Courts, a part of the clergy began to look favourably on the system of bondage to which they were habituated. The Faculty of Theology of the Sorbonne, which had long before given an infamous example of servility in the condemnation of Joan of Arc,[520] espoused the cause of the Parliaments of France. Already during the schism the maxims of Occam, of Marsilius of Padua, and afterwards of D'Ailly and Gerson, had prepared the minds of its leaders to uphold principles of a schismatical tendency. Moreover, by the influence of the jurisconsults and the ambition of the Kings of France, those only were called to ecclesiastical dignities and honours who showed themselves favourable to the new system. This is proved by the promotion of De Marca to a place in the Royal Council, through the good offices of Dupuy; and the practice was an encouragement to every ambitious spirit to defend doctrines, the advocacy of which would open the way to preferment. In this manner, a body of men soon arose formed in the principles of the school called Gallican—courtiers, ambitious, ready to sacrifice the unity of the Church itself for the sake of pleasing the King and the Parliaments. These filled the highest places in the Church of France, and tried to wean the clergy from that spirit of submission and devotion to the Apostolic See of which it had ever given the brightest examples.[521] Hence, the tendency towards

[520] Duvernet: *Histoire de la Sorbonne*, t. i., c. xxi., p. 143; c. xxii., p. 146, seq. Paris, 1791.

[521] Alexander III., in his Letter xxx. to Louis VII. of France, says: "Ecclesia Gallicana inter omnes alias orbis Ecclesias, quæcumque aliæ provenientibus scandalis in tribulatione nutassent, nunquam a Catholicæ matris Ecclesiæ unitate recessit, nunquam ab ejus subjectione et reverentia se subtraxit, sed tanquam devotissima filia firma semper et stabilis in ejus devotione permansit" (Labbe, t. xiii., App. Sirmondi. ii., p. 179). Gregory IX., in a letter to the Archbishop of Rheims, says: "Gallicana Ecclesia post

a formal schism grew so strong that in the seventeenth century it would have ended in a real separation had the King been favourable to such a course. The reign of Louis XIV., and especially the dispute between that monarch and Innocent XI. on the subject of the *regalia*, afford plain proofs of what is here advanced. The Council of Lyons, in 1274, had conceded to the King of France the right of the *regalia* for those sees only which had already been subject to his crown; but it severely forbade the further extension of this right.[522] Now Louis XIV. resolved to extend it to all the Churches of France, and to impose upon the clergy the burden of a new servitude.[523] Innocent XI. firmly resisted the pretensions of the King;[524] but the Parliament proclaimed that right to be inherent in the Crown, assigning the ridiculous reason that the Crown of France was round.[525] And the French bishops, who in former times would have protested against such a usurpation, now, with the exception of those of Pamiers and Alet, so far bowed to the will of the King and of the Parliament, as to address to the Pope a letter advising him to consent to the decree of the Parliament.[526] But in vain—Innocent XI. was inflexible in

Apostolicam Sedem est quoddam totius Christianitatis speculum et immotum fidei fundamentum, utpote quæ in fervore fidei Christianæ ac devotione Apostolicæ Sedis non sequatur alias sed antecedat" (in Opere cit., Soardi, pt. ii., p. 199. Extr. from the Preface of Langlet to the *Commentary* of Dupuy on the work of Pithou).

[522] *Conc. Lugdun.* ii., can. xii. (Labbe, t. xiv., p. 528).

[523] Even the French bishops acknowledged that the *Regalia* were a new servitude for the Church of France.—See Sfondrati: *Gallia Vindicata*, diss. i., sec. iv., p. 79. Edit. 1702.

[524] See Sfondrati: Op. cit., l. c., p. 78, seq.

[525] Fleury: *Nouveaux Opuscules. Anecdotes sur l'Assemblée de* 1682, p. 136, seq.

[526] *Epistola Cleri Gallicani ad Innocentium XI.* (in Op. cit., Sfondrati, docum. lviii., p. 335, seq., et docum. lix., p. 345, seq.).

his resistance.[527] Whereupon, Colbert and Le Tellier, the ministers of the King, persuaded Louis XIV. to assemble a national synod of all the bishops of France, with the view of putting pressure upon the Pope.[528] The questions intended by Colbert for discussion in that assembly (1682) regarded the nature and limits of the Papal prerogatives, for he thought that in a period of dissension the episcopate would contend for its liberty, and set limits to what he called Papal encroachments. Notwithstanding the opposition of Bossuet, who foresaw the dangerous effects of agitating this question, the King gave orders that it should be treated in the synod.[529] Colbert drew up the famous propositions to be presented for sanction to the assembled bishops, though they owe their final arrangement to the hand of Bossuet.[530] The question was one of the utmost importance for the whole of France. The French bishops, accustomed to a servile submission to the King, would have been ready to proclaim a schism, had not such a course been strongly opposed by the eloquence of Bossuet; moreover, it would have been contrary to the intentions of Louis XIV., who, satisfied with the bishops having adopted the Four Articles of the Declaration, dissolved the assembly immediately after the signature of the bishops had been appended, decreeing, at the same time, that the declaration should be acknowledged throughout the kingdom of France.[531]

[527] *Responsio Innocentii XI. ad Epistolam Cleri Gallicani* (*ibid.*, docum. lix., p. 345, seq.).

[528] Fleury: *Anecdotes* cit., p. 138, seq.

[529] *Ibid.*, p. 139.

[530] Le Dieu: *Mémoires et Journal sur la vie et les ouvrages de Bossuet*, vol. i., p. 8. Paris, 1856.

[531] The decree of the King was registered by the Parliament on March 23rd, 1682.—See De Maistre: Op. cit., l. ii., c. xi., p. 305, seq.

IX. The Four Articles regard, first, the nature of the power of the Pope, limited, according to the declaration, to spiritual things, *i.e.*, things concerning the salvation of souls; the second states, that the plenitude of the authority of the Apostolic See must be reconciled with the decrees of the Fourth and Fifth Sessions of Constance, which were not to be understood of the case and time of schism only; the third asserts the irrevocability of the so-called Gallican liberties; the last maintains, that the judgments of the Pope on matters of faith are reformable, that is, open to correction and subject to revision. Although the Four Articles contain assertions most erroneous, and most contrary to the doctrine of even the Gallican Church in earlier times, yet Bossuet drew them up in such a vague and indefinite manner that, in many instances, they admit of a mitigated interpretation. Moreover, Bossuet could not be induced to number amongst the doctrines of the French Church the right of appeal to a council from the sentence of the Pope, since he well knew that this doctrine had been repeatedly condemned by the Bulls of Pius II. and Julius II., and even of Martin V. in the Council of Constance.[532] Bossuet was, unquestionably, the draftsman only, and not the promoter of the Four Articles, as Fleury himself confesses.[533] He tried by every means to discourage the assembly from entering into the path along which it blindly advanced under the standard of the Gallican liberties. He courageously attacked the declaration of the Bishop of Tournay, declaring it to be schismatical in its tendency, and procuring its rejection.[534] Bossuet, it is true, drew up

[532] Fleury: *Anecdotes*, p. 139.

[533] *Ibid.*, l. c., pp. 174-75. "Bossuet est bien le rédacteur des Quatre Articles, mais il n'en fut point le promoteur."

[534] See Fénélon: *De Summi Pontificis Auctoritate*, c. vii., cui titulus: "Narratur controversia Dni. Bossueti Epis. Meld. adv. Dnm. Choisseul Episc. Tornacensem" (Op., t. ii., p. 269, seq. Edit. Versailles, 1820).

the Four Articles; but in them he expressed the doctrines of the assembly, for which the French Government was mainly responsible. The fault of Bossuet was that of an exaggerated submission, or rather, of a pitiful servility towards King Louis XIV.; and it was in obedience to that monarch that he undertook the *Defence of the Declaration of the Assembly of* 1682, against the work of Roccaberti, Archbishop of Valencia. A man like Bossuet could not act against his conscience. He, therefore, recast his work two or three times. He kept it unpublished for no less than twenty years. Before his death, he attempted to write it anew upon different principles, and to give it the title of *Gallia Orthodoxa.* Being surprised by death, he rigorously required of his nephew, the Abbé Bossuet, to let no one have the work, but to place it in the hands of the King alone. That monarch, who always held Catholic principles when his mind was not blinded by his passions, had already yielded to the ever-increasing reluctance felt by Bossuet to publish a work so injurious to the Church and dangerous to Catholic nations. He, accordingly, refused to receive the deposit at the hands of the nephew of the deceased prelate; and only after six years of importunity did he consent to let it lie in a box in his royal palace.[535] It was the nephew of Bossuet—unworthy to bear that illustrious name—who, forty-one years after the death of his uncle, published at Amsterdam the *Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani* (1745), having previously secured the loss of the papers in which Bossuet, on his death bed, had recast his work.[536] Bossuet had deeply considered for twenty years the

[535] See the two beautiful chapters vii. and viii. of bk. ii. of *l'Eglise Gallicane*, of the Count de Maistre, who confirms with important documents what we here assert with regard to Bossuet (p. 257, seq. Edit. cit.).

[536] De Maistre: Op. cit., l. ii., c. ix., p. 278, seq.

effect of the Gallican Declaration, and had clearly understood its inconsistency. The books written during that time against the Four Articles had cleared away former prejudice, and opened his eyes to the abyss of schism and heresy into which they were leading the Church of France. Hence his perplexity, his trouble, and his repentance with regard to his volume, which always weighed on his mind as a most heavy burden. Bossuet himself would never have consented to publish a work from which the enemies of the Church have so eagerly drawn weapons against her. He had already, in a manner, judged and condemned the book by keeping it for twenty years in his secret desk, and by confiding it, under the condition above mentioned, in his last will, to his nephew, the Abbé Bossuet, who treacherously violated the trust. We, therefore, cannot regard the *Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, as a fair exponent of the mind of the Bishop of Meaux,[537] nor even as a genuine production of his hand. But whatever may have been the authority of Bossuet and of the

[537] Bossuet, long before his death, had understood the slavery into which the so-called Gallican liberties had plunged the Church of France. On the 5th Oct., 1707, he wrote to Cardinal de Noailles, as follows: "J' implore le secours de Madame de Maintenon, à qui je n' ose écrire (great liberty of a Gallican bishop!). Votre Eminence fera ce qu'il faut; Dieu nous la conserve! On nous croira à la fin, et le temps découvrira la vérité; mais il est à craindre que ce ne soit trop tard, et lorsque le mal aura fait de trop grands progrès. J' ai le cœur percé de cette crainte" (*Hist. de Bossuet*, par Bausset, l. xii., n. 24, t. iv., p. 289, seq. Versailles, 1814). In another letter, of the 31st Oct., 1702, he had written: "Il est bien extraordinaire que pour exercer notre ministère, il nous faille prendre l'attache de M. le Chancellier, et *achever de mettre l'Eglise sous le joug*. Pour moi j'y mettrais la tête." On the 24th Oct., in his letter to Cardinal de Noailles, he said: "On veut mettre tous les évêques sous le joug, dans le point qui les intéresse le plus, dans l'essentiel de leur ministère qui est la foi!" (l. c., p. 290).

Gallican bishops of the Assembly of 1682, as soon as the Four Articles were published, the whole Catholic world lifted up its voice to condemn them as absurd and detestable.[538] The University of Douay addressed to the King a formal complaint against the Declaration. The Sorbonne itself, which had given great support to the Gallican system, refused it admission on the *Register*. But the Parliament of Paris, with its usual overbearing manner, inserted the Articles in the register of the university, regarding them as the stronghold of Cæsarism and of its own uncontrollable despotism over the Church.[539] Nevertheless, the sentence of unanimous condemnation pronounced by the Catholic world was confirmed by the voice of the Apostolic See. Innocent XI., in his Brief of April 11th, 1682, addressed to the Assembly of the Gallican Bishops, declared null and void of all effect all the acts of that ecclesiastical assembly, and exhorted the clergy to make a frank and speedy recantation of their proceedings.[540] Moreover, he firmly refused to grant confirmation of episcopal dignity to those who had promised by oath to maintain the Four Articles of the Declaration.[541] Alexander VIII., his successor, went further, and shortly before his death

[538] The Assembly of the bishops of Hungary, by the decree of Oct. 24th, 1682, used these terms of the *Gallican Declaration*. The Spanish episcopate (July 10th, 1683) openly protested against this famous Declaration.

[539] De Maistre: Op. cit., l. ii., c. v., p. 228.

[540] *Responsio Innocentii XI. ad Epist. Cleri Gallic.* (*In Gallia Vindicata*, diss. i., sec. viii., doc. lix., p. 345, seq.).

[541] Rohrbacher: *Hist. Univ. de l'Eglise*, t. xxvi., l. lxxxviii., p. 219. Louis XIV. thereupon ordered that the Chapters should appoint as spiritual administrators those who had been elected to the episcopal dignity. In this manner he violated the decree of the Second Œcumenical Council of Lyons, while maintaining in the articles of the declaration that the Pope could not change the canons of the general councils. What inconsistency!

published (Aug. 4th, 1690) in the presence of twelve cardinals the Bull *Inter Multiplices,* by which he condemned and annulled the Articles of the Declaration of March 2nd, 1682.[542] Finally, Innocent XII. succeeded in persuading Louis XIV. to withdraw the Gallican Declaration, and to allow the clergy to send to the Apostolic See an authentic act of entire submission and formal retractation.[543] Such were the terms imposed on the King as the condition of the confirmation of bishops named by him. But, notwithstanding these acts of retractation and of submission, the spirit of the Gallican principles was not extinguished in the clergy of France, and especially in the Parliaments of that kingdom. The Jansenists spared no effort to revive in full vigour that spirit of opposition and rebellion against the Sovereign Pontiff; so that in the beginning of the eighteenth century the Gallican bishops, in an encyclical letter, insisted upon those very maxims of the Gallican system which Alexander VIII. had already condemned. Clement XI. was obliged to renew (Aug. 31st, 1706), in a brief to Louis XIV., the condemnation passed upon the Declaration, and to warn the monarch that principles such as those proclaimed in the Church of France, would, whilst they struck at the root of ecclesiastical authority, shake also, and overthrow along with it, his royal power.[544] But after the death of Louis XIV., during the regency of the libertine Duke of Orleans, all hopes of bettering the condition of affairs were dashed to

[542] *Bulla Alexandri VIII.*, n. xxii. (*Bullarium Romanum*, t. x., p. 38, seq.).

[543] *The Letter of Louis XIV. to the Pope*, in Soardi, Op. cit., pt. ii., c. viii., p. 132. See also De Maistre: Op. cit., l. ii., c. vi., p. 235, seq. *The Letter of the Bishops to the Pope*, in Fleury, *Anecdotes* cit., p. 167. See, moreover, De Maistre: Op. cit., l. ii., c. vii., p. 245, seq.

[544] De Maistre: Op. cit., l. ii., c. iv., p. 225, seq.

the ground. The Jansenists lifted up their heads, and with them the Gallican spirit arose more boldly than ever, finding new allies in the infidel party which was dominant in the Parliaments of France. Louis XV. published anew the edict of the 2nd March, 1682; and the Gallican maxims, strengthened by royal favour, spread rapidly in France, and prepared the field for the great Revolution which overthrew the throne and the altar. Pius VI., in his Bull *Auctorem Fidei* (Aug. 28th, 1794), struck another blow at the Gallican system;[545] yet its deadly influence was not extinct at the end of the Great Revolution, and exhausted and lifeless as it seemed after that sanguinary epoch, it still lingered on for some years. But in vain. In 1826, we find a few bishops only who endeavoured by their example to recall it to life. Their proclamations met with no response from the clergy, who had learned from a long and painful experience that Gallicanism was nothing but a sure source of slavery for the Church of France.[546] At present it lies like a dead corpse, which the Universitarian Bureaucracy galvanizes from time to time in order to fetter anew the liberty of the Church.

XI. From what we have said in this section, we must conclude that no argument in favour of the Anglican views of the Church can be drawn from the maxims of the Gallican sect. We have seen that those maxims owe their origin to the spirit of schism and rebellion propagated in Europe under the shelter of ambitious princes during the fourteenth and fifteenth

[545] *Bulla Pii VI.*, n. 985 (*Bull. Rom. Contin.*, t. ix., p. 395).

[546] See on the subject of the Gallican liberties and their evil fruits, the *Dissertation historique sur les libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane et l'Assemblé du Clergé de France de* 1682—1829. Moreover, Carné: *La Monarchie Française au* xviii. *Siècle.* 1857. Rupert: *Le Gallicanisme et l'ancien régime.* 1862. Cantù: *Hist. Univ.*, t. xvi., c. ix., p. 161, seq. Paris, 1865.

centuries, and to the pagan maxims of Cæsarism which, already wide-spread in Europe, prevailed principally in the Parliaments and Court of France. We have seen, too, that if at a later period the clergy began to profess those principles, the cause is to be sought in servility rather than in heresy. The clergy of France condemned in practice the errors of the Declaration, because they have always professed the divine supremacy of the Apostolic See, and expressly rejected in their formulary of submission every principle injurious to that supreme authority. The Articles, indeed, were never logically confronted by the French clergy with the doctrine of the divine supremacy of the Pope, nor developed according to the principles of rigorous discussion. Had the clergy followed more closely in the steps of Jansenism, they would have arrived at the fatal and heretical conclusions which Febronius (Nicholas de Hontheim) drew from Gallicanism, as explained to him by his master, Zeger Bernard Van Espen.[547] But the French priesthood submitted to the dogmatic condemnation of Jansenism pronounced by the Supreme Head of the Church; and even those, who with Cardinal de Noailles had appealed to the future General Council against the Bull *Unigenitus*, did not dare to resist the Bull *Pastoralis Officii* (1717) of Clement XI., in which the major excommunication was threatened against those who had persisted in the rejection of the earlier decision. Shortly after, the clergy with the King solemnly condemned Jansenism, which from that time ceased to have legal existence in France. Of course its schismatical spirit continued to find a dwelling in the Parliaments, which had ever been the stronghold of the separatist tendency of Gallicanism. But the clergy of France

[547] Zaccaria: *Antifebronius vindicatus*, vol. ii., dissert. v., c. vi., p. 448, seq. Cæsenæ, 1771.

remained Catholic, however inconsistently with their Gallican principles;[548] and on this account the Apostolic See, whilst repeatedly condemning the Articles of the Declaration, did not denounce the French clergy as guilty of schism or heresy. On the other hand, Clement XIII. did not abstain from applying the censure of heresy to the errors of Febronius;[549] and the bishops of Germany unanimously assented to that condemnation.[550] It is, therefore, vain for Dr. Pusey to long to see the Church united on a basis of Gallicanism. The Church can rest only on the immoveable rock on which Christ built it. That rock is the Pope's divine supremacy. The Gallicans were Catholics in the age of Louis XIV. and of his successor, because they confessed this divine supremacy as a revealed dogma. Dr. Pusey and his followers will be Protestants, and separated from the Church of Christ, as long as they persist in denying that doctrine, for it is the standard and the test of Catholicity.

[548] See c. xvi., l. ii., Op. cit. of Count de Maistre, p. 375, seq., in which the learned writer examines the causes which kept the Gallican Church in submission to the Holy See. He reduces those causes to three: the prudence and moderation of the Popes, the Catholic attachment of the French Kings to Rome, and the noble character of the Gallican clergy.

[549] See the letters of Clement XIII. to the Bishops of Wurtzburg and Mayence (*Bullarium Rom. Continuat.*, t. ii., pp. 450-51).

[550] See Zaccaria: App. *Monumentorum in Antifebr. Vindic.*, t. i., diss. i., c. i., p. 35, seq. Edit. cit.

SECTION VIII.

THE DIVINE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE AND THE GENERAL COUNCILS — SYNODS OF CONSTANCE AND OF FLORENCE.

I. THE task we undertake in this section, is to prove that the doctrines contained in the Four Articles of 1682 concerning Papal authority, are not only in contradiction with other doctrines admitted in the Gallican system, but, also, that they were unheard of in the early Church. Nevertheless, since the second part of this work will be altogether devoted to the consideration of Papal infallibility, we shall in this section confine ourselves to examining the Second of the Gallican Articles, which maintains the superiority of general councils to the Pope. It runs thus—"The decrees of the Œcumenical Council of Constance, enacted in the Fourth and Fifth Session, approved by the holy Apostolic See, confirmed by the practice of the whole Church and of the Roman Pontiffs, and religiously observed by the Gallican Church, are to remain in their full vigour." And it is added, that "The Church of France does not approve the opinion of those who attempt to represent these decrees as void of authority, or as intended only for the time of schism." According to what is here said to be the teaching of the Gallican Church, the Synod of Constance ruled that the general council is superior to the Pope, even in the normal state of the Church; and that decrees to this effect had been approved by the Pope himself, and confirmed by the practice of the whole Church.

At the same time a profession is made of belief that the Pope possesses by divine right the plenitude of authority in spiritual matters.

II. Before turning our attention to these two singular assertions of the Gallican Articles, we will notice their evident inconsistency with the doctrine of that divine supremacy which they maintain. For if the Pope is the visible head of the Church, and therefore of all the bishops, who, as a part of Christ's flock, were entrusted to him, how can he be inferior to the council? The council, in reality, detached from the Pope, is nothing but a headless corpse; and it would be foolish to inquire whether such a body is superior to the head. The head represents the principles of direction and command over all the members, which so adhere to it as to coalesce in the unity of a human body. As the body without the head is a lifeless trunk, so the assembly of the bishops without the head of the Church cannot represent the body of the Church —the mystical body of Christ and the abode of the Holy Ghost. Should such a separation take place in the Universal Church, the Church would cease to exist. Christ did not establish his Church as a corpse deprived of its head, but as a perfect and living body, in which He was eternally to dwell by His Holy Spirit. As, therefore, it is impossible that the gift of indefectibility should depart from the Church, so it is absurd to imagine that the true visible head of the Church can detach itself from the mystical body of Christ. It is, consequently, absurd to institute comparisons between the body and the head in a state of real separation, and yet in a state of life and action. On this account, the question whether or no the Pope be superior to the council, having no meaning, is absurd. What existence can a council have without the Pope? The council represents the Universal Church; but the Universal

Church does not exist apart from its visible head, which is the centre of its unity and the fountain of its life. The question, therefore, as proposed by the Gallicans, is absurd in its very terms, unless a denial be implied of the vital organization of the Church under one head, and consequently of the divine supremacy of the Pope. But were it possible to compare the whole of the bishops in a general assembly with the Pope, in what sense could the subordination of the Pope to such an assembly be maintained? Are not all the bishops sheep and lambs entrusted to the care of Peter, and in him to that of all his successors? Were not the keys of the kingdom of heaven given to Peter? Was not he appointed the rock on which the whole Church should be built? If so, how can he be subordinate to them? How could they be otherwise than in the number of his lambs and sheep? How could they cease to be founded on him, and kept under his supreme jurisdiction? The idea which the Fathers and the Doctors in every age conceived of the constitution of the Church, of itself excludes and condemns the Gallican error, that the assembly of the bishops is superior to the Pope.

III. We have in the preceding section traced the origin of what is called Gallicanism, and have given the names of the authors who originated it, with the reasons which led them into their error—Gerson, D'Ailly, and their faction, who confounded the normal with the abnormal state of the Church. When a Pope has been canonically elected and universally acknowledged, he is divinely empowered to rule the Universal Church; and clergy and people of every rank are subject to him. But when the validity of his election is contested, at least, when the opinion of a large part of Christendom is adverse to it, he cannot enforce his authority over the whole Church; nor are submission and

obedience to be required from those who call in question the canonicity of his election and regard him as an intruder. If this party come to the resolution of choosing another Pope, and consider him as the true Vicar of Christ, then a *material* breach of unity, a *material* schism, separates the members of the same Church: but as all still acknowledge one head, one centre of authority over the whole Church, according to Christ's institution, they have not *formally* broken the bond of unity, since they are only doubtful as to the person who by canonical election has inherited the divine right of supremacy in the Church. This was the case in the Western schism. Now, since the Church has the right to existence in accordance with the constitution of Christ, it has, consequently, the right of pronouncing a final sentence on the fact of the election of the two Popes, and of restoring the external bonds of unity and charity to all. In this way we see that during such a schism the bishops of Christendom have the right and duty to assemble together with or without the contending Popes, in order to ascertain the truth concerning the contested election, and to find out the fittest means of restoring personal unity in the headship of the Church. But having once declared the legitimate Pope, whom all should obey, and reinstated the Church in its normal position, their task is at an end, and the helm of the Church passes of itself into the hands of the Pope lawfully elected and universally recognised. Hence, general assemblies of bishops, such as those of Pisa and Constance, up to the time of the election of Martin V., are not councils, properly speaking, either general or particular, because they do not represent the Church in its normal state, and they have no other authority except that of giving to the Catholic Church a visible head, to whom St. Peter's power is divinely transferred. They cannot, consequently, be said to be

in any manner superior to the Pope; because, during that state of uncertainty and material schism, the Pope is not visible to the Church, nor is he able to exercise his divine power over it. They have no mission but that of dissipating the clouds which keep the true Pope from the eyes of the true Church; or, if that be not possible, of choosing canonically a new Pope, who shall be acknowledged by all as the Vicar of Christ. But when the lawful Pope appears, these assemblies cease to have any legal authority and existence in the Church, unless they receive the sanction of the new Pontiff and are presided over by him and his legates. This is the doctrine of all antiquity, which was so universally and firmly held in the Church when the Western schism broke out, that the opposite opinion was suspected of heresy, and generally condemned. We need not quote many authorities on this point, as this truth was explicitly admitted by Gerson himself. He says that at the time of the Council of Constance, God enlightened the minds of all, that they might understand that the Pope was subordinate to the general synod.[551] But before that council, as he acknowledges, the doctrine of the Pope's superiority to the council was so universally maintained, that those who dogmatised in the opposite sense were suspected of heresy, or were considered to be guilty of it.[552] This admission of Gerson

[551] "Benedictus Deus qui per hoc sacrosanctum Constantiense concilium illustratum divinæ legis lumine, dante ad hoc ipsum vexatione præsentis schismatis intellectum, liberavit Ecclesiam suam ab hac pestifera, perniciosissimaque doctrina (namely, that the Pope is superior to the general council)."—*Ibid*, consid. x., p. 127.

[552] "Ante celebrationem hujus sacrosanctæ Constantiensis Synodi sic occupaverat mentes plurimorum, *literarum* magis quam *literatorum* ista traditio, ut oppositorum dogmatizator fuisset de hæretica pravitate vel notatus vel damnatus."—Gerson: *De Potestate Ecclesiastica*, consid. xii., p. 135 (pt. i. Op. Edit. Parisiis, 1606).

enables us to dispense with further discussion on this point. Nevertheless, after having examined the decrees of Constance, and destroyed the main foundation of this error, we shall return to the subject. But by an inquiry into the purport of the Articles of Constance, we hope not only to overthrow the foundation of the Gallican system, but also to afford the reader a new argument in favour of the divine supremacy of the Roman Pontiff.

IV. Now, in order to give a just idea of the well-known decrees of the Fourth and Fifth Sessions of the Council of Constance, it is necessary to state beforehand the occasion and the circumstances under which they were framed. The Synod of Pisa, which, notwithstanding the election of Alexander V., opened amidst very sanguine expectations on all sides, nevertheless failed to satisfy the hopes universally entertained of its terminating the schism. Nay, the Church had then to lament the existence of three Popes, who multiplied the divisions of Christendom. But John XXIII., successor of Alexander V., with the consent of Sigismund, Emperor of Germany, summoned at Constance (Nov. 5, 1414) a general council, in order to apply a remedy to the evils of the Church, and put an end to the lamentable schism. When, however, the synod was solemnly opened at Constance by John XXIII., the assembled Fathers thought that there was no better means of doing away with the schism than the voluntary resignation of all the three Popes, and the election of another by the three obediences. John XXIII. had been persuaded to resign; and in the Second General Session, in accordance with that promise, he adopted a formula satisfactory to the council, and swore to it.[553] But,

[553] Lenfant: *Hist. du Conc. de Constance*, l. i., sec. lxxix., t. i., p. 76. Edit. Amsterdam, 1714.—See also Labbe, *Conc. Const.*, sess. vi., t. xvi., p. 91; and Hardt, t. iv., p. 53.

afterwards, he secretly left Constance and repaired to Schaffhaussen, under the pretext of bad health (March 2nd, 1415). It was then that the Fathers, encouraged by the language of Gerson and of the Emperor Sigismund himself, resolved to continue the synod, despite the departure of the Pope, and to pass a solemn decree declaratory of their authority. In fact, in the Third Session it was asserted that, notwithstanding the departure of the Pope, the council remained undissolved; and when next the council met, the four famous Articles were enacted, which appeared to claim for a general council superiority to the Pope (March 29th).[554] All the Italian bishops and cardinals opposed these decrees, and declared

[554] The First and the Second Articles are as follows: "Hæc sancta Synodus Constantiensis, generale concilium faciens pro extirpatione presentis schismatis et unione et reformatione Ecclesiæ Dei in capite et in membris fienda ad laudem Omnipotentis Dei in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata, ad consequendum facilius, securius, uberius et liberius unionem et reformationem Ecclesiæ Dei ordinat, definit, statuit, decernit et declarat ut sequitur. Et primo declarat quod ipsa in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata generale concilium faciens et Ecclesiam Catholicam militantem representans, potestatem a Christo immediate habet, cui quilibet cujuscumque status vel dignitatis, etiamsi Papalis existat, obedire tenetur in his, quæ pertinent ad fidem et extirpationem dicti schismatis, ac generalem reformationem Ecclesiæ Dei in capite et in membris. Item declarat quod quicumque, cujuscumque conditionis, status vel dignitatis etiamsi Papalis existat, qui mandatis statutis, seu ordinationibus, aut præceptis hujus sanctæ synodi aut cujuscumque alterius concilii generalis legitime congregati, super præmissis, seu ad ea pertinentibus, factis, vel faciendis obedire contumaciter contempserit, nisi resipuerit, condignæ pœnitentiæ subjiciatur et debite puniatur, etiam ad alia juris subsidia, si opus fuerit, recurrendo."—*Conc. Const.*, sess. iv. (Labbe, t. xvi., p. 67; Hardt, t. iv., p. 89). Schelestrate has abundantly proved (in his *Diss. Hist. Theolog. in Act. Conc. Constant.*) by many old MSS. of this council, that the clause of the First Article did not exist in the original decree of the Fourth Session.

that they would not attend the council unless, at least, the clause of the First Article concerning the reformation of the Church in its head and its members, as well as the whole of the three last, were suppressed. They finally agreed that only the clause objected to of the First, and the whole of the Second Article, should be omitted. Nevertheless, in the Fifth Session, through the influence of Gerson's party, the articles re-appeared without alteration. In spite of this, in order to avoid scandal, the cardinals did not cease to attend the session, but refused to vote.[555] On this a double question arises—first, were those Articles proposed by the Assembly of Constance as a matter of faith? secondly, were they received by the majority of the synod without any limitation, and as general principles of ecclesiastical law even for the normal state of the Church? Questions of such importance as these call for a rigorous examination.

V. With regard to the first, we must remark, in the first place, that the Articles in question do not exhibit any of those characteristics which distinguish a doctrinal decree. The synod did not promulgate the maxims of the Four Articles as dogmas, nor did it qualify the contrary views as heretical; nor did it even impose them as articles of belief upon the faithful. These Articles were unquestionably proposed by the council as *synodical constitutions*—the term applied to them in the acts themselves.[556] Neither could they have any of the authority belonging to a decree enacted by a general council. For to clothe a synodical decree with that authority, it is necessary that it should be maturely discussed in the general assembly, according to the

[555] *Act. Conc. Constant.* a Schelestrate edita (Labbe, t. xvi., p. 76, seq.); Lenfant, l. ii., sec. xv., seq., sec. xxv., seq., p. 101, seq., p. 114, seq.

[556] Labbe: *Conc. Constant.*, sess. iv., v. (t. xvi., pp. 66, 72).

invariable practice of all œcumenical councils. Now, the Four Articles were discussed only in a private meeting of some theologians, under the presidency of Cardinal Zabarella ; and it was there that the resolution was taken to publish them in their integrity, as having been framed by the Chancellor of Paris.[557] Thus the greater part of the bishops and doctors of the assembly had no opportunity of raising their voices in favour of the Catholic doctrine in a matter which concerns the very essence of the Church's constitution. The victory was won in the council by the Gerson faction, whose doctrines had already been solemnly put forth, both before and during the council,[558] in spite of the protest of the whole College of the Cardinals, and the opposition of the most learned theologians of the time. In fact, when, in the Sixth Session, Cardinal D'Ailly proposed that the sentence of condemnation against Wiclyffe should be issued in the name of the council, without any mention of the Pope, twelve only of the theologians appointed to report on the matter agreed with D'Ailly; the others firmly maintained that the council had power only when closely united with the head of the Church.[559] The discussion and decision are new evidences going to prove that the Articles of the Fourth and Fifth Sessions were not intended as matters of faith, especially as the Patriarch of Antioch openly asserted in the Sixth Session that, the Pope being superior to the council, every decree should be pub-

[557] Lenfant: Op. cit., l. ii., sec. xviii., p. 108. He quotes the acts as edited by Hardt and Schelestrate.

[558] See the works of Gerson, especially that on the *Power of the Church*, quoted above, and the *Oration* delivered to the council after the departure of John XXIII. (Op., pt. i., p. 317, seq.).

[559] See Lenfant, l. ii., sec. xlii., seq., p. 131 ; and Hardt., t. iv., p. 136.

lished in his name, and not in that of the council,[560] while Cardinal D'Ailly did not dare to accuse him of heresy.[561] Nothing was ever defined as of faith concerning which the Roman Church and its head were not consulted, or against which the whole College of the Cardinals entered its protest. It was determined by the Council of Constance itself that, without the Cardinals as representatives of the Roman Church, no decree of faith should be passed in the synod.[562] Now, Martin V. openly declared to the Poles that he intended to approve those decrees only which had been enacted in accordance with the rules of general councils (*conciliariter*).[563] But the Articles in question, as we have seen, did not satisfy these conditions; because, (1.) they were not properly and publicly discussed by the council, and (2.) they were not approved by the Roman Church and its head the Pope. These cannot, therefore, be comprehended among the decrees which Martin V. intended to sanction in his answer to the Polish deputies. Finally, we have in our favour D'Ailly and Gerson themselves. For D'Ailly, in his treatise *De Ecclesiæ et Cardinalium Potestate*, after having endeavoured to prove that the general council is superior to the Pope, professes at the end that he did not mean to decide the question, but only to put forward arguments favouring his view, leaving it to the general council to pronounce a definitive sentence on the subject.[564]

[560] *Propositio Patriarchæ Antiochiæ* (Labbe, t. xvi., App. *Conc. Constant.*, n. xiii., p. 821, seq. Hardt, t. ii., p. 295; t. iv., p. 64).

[561] Lenfant: l. ii., sec. xlvi., seq., p. 134, seq.

[562] See Hardt: t. ii., p. 288. Becchetti: *Hist. Eccl. Continuazione d' Orsi.*, t. ii., p. 337, seq.

[563] *Conc. Const.*, sess. xlv. (Labbe, t. xvi., pp. 746—748).

[564] "Quæ tamen non definitive determinando sed doctrinaliter suadendo posita sunt: nam hujus rei definitionem sacri Concilii determinationi submitto."—D'Ailly: *De Ecclesiæ et Cardinalium Potestate*, c. iv., pt. iii. (in Gersonis Op., pt. i., p. 934).

He would not have spoken thus in a matter of faith. Moreover, Gerson, in another treatise which bears the same title, says that, after the Council of Constance, the contrary doctrine was held by many.[565] This shows that the Articles were not really received by the synod as definitions of faith. Let us proceed to inquire what is the true meaning of these synodical constitutions.

VI. Protestants—German as well as English—have asserted that the Fathers of Constance ruled that the council is superior to the Pope, and that the former has a coercive power over the latter. The Gallicans maintained the same principle, and asserted it in the second of the Four Articles of 1682. "A peculiar embarrassment," says Gieseler, "was prepared for the Popes by the fact that they were obliged to regard the Council of Constance as œcumenical, in order to prove the validity of their own succession; while they were, nevertheless, compelled to reject its fundamental principles, which were the groundwork of the Gallican system."[566] Mr. Palmer also thinks that, "The Synod of Constance decreed that a general council was superior to the Pope."[567] It is doubtless true that the Gerson faction had no other purpose in view in drawing up the Articles in question. The writings published by Gerson, both before and during the council, and especially his *Oration* after the departure of John XXIII., would afford sufficient evidence of the fact, even were we destitute of other proofs. But it is not established that the majority of the Assembly of Constance admitted these Articles in the precise sense of the Gerson

[565] Gerson: *De Potestate Ecclesiastica*, consid. xii. (Op., pt. i., p. 135. Edit. cit.).

[566] Gieseler: *History of the Church*, vol. iv., pt. iii., c. i., sec. 136, p. 432.

[567] Palmer: *Church of Christ*, pt. iv., c. xi., sec. iv., vol. ii., p. 172.

faction. On the contrary, we have sufficient proofs that they did not approve them as guiding principles for the normal state of the Church, and with regard to a Pope lawfully elected and universally recognised as the legitimate head of the Church. We maintain that these Articles were understood to hold good only for the time of a schism caused by doubts as to the legitimate Pope. We will state briefly the chief reasons in support of our assertion. First, all know how anxious the Fathers of Constance were, that, after the grievous disorders caused by the schism, a scheme should be drawn up for reform in the discipline of the Church. Now, in the Session xxxviii., the German nation proposed that should the Pope about to be chosen neglect before his coronation to secure the reform intended by the council, the decree of his election should be invalidated. But the assembly rejected the proposal, remarking that, "The Pope, once elected, could not be so bound."[568] In accordance, therefore, with that resolution, a decree of reformation was framed by the council in the Session xl. without any penal sanction, because it concerned the legitimate Pontiff then about to be elected.[569] They adopted the same course with regard to the synods which were to be assembled by the new Pope.[570] But in that very session, when they were contemplating the case of a schism in the event of contending Popes, they imposed on such the obligation of calling a general council, adding the most grievous penalties, and even deposition, in case of neglect.[571] Now, the striking difference of these decrees affords a key to the meaning of the Articles of the

[568] "Electus non potest ligari."—*Conc. Const.*, sess. xxxviii. (Labbe, l. c., pp. 694-5).

[569] *Ibid.*, sess. xl., p. 706, seq.

[570] *Ibid.*, sess. xxxix, p. 700.

[571] *Ibid.*, pp. 701-2.

Fourth and Fifth Session. We see that when the council treats of doubtful Popes, it exercises a coercive power, but when it deals with certain and legitimate Popes, it lays no claim to such power, because the lawfully-elected cannot be bound. Hence the Articles of the Fourth and Fifth Session have reference only to a doubtful Pope in a time of schism. Moreover, in the last session of the same council, when the representatives of the Polish nation intended to appeal to the future council from the sentence of the Pope, Martin V. inhibited them from so doing under pain of excommunication.[572] And yet in that numerous assembly no one objected; for, had any one raised his voice against the Papal sentence, Gerson would not have failed to mention the fact in the treatise which he wrote on the subject after the council had separated.[573] On the contrary, the person who had been the author of the Articles of the Fourth and Fifth Session, and had understood them in the Gallican sense, remarked, that they could not be reconciled with the decision of Martin V. against the appeal to the council.[574] Nor did the Synod of Constance attempt even to exercise any power of supremacy by the deposition of the three conflicting Popes. From the Acts of the Council, it clearly appears that John XXIII. was not deposed by the council, but he himself, by a solemn act, resigned his Papal dignity into the hands of the synod.[575] Gregory XII. followed in the same path, and committed his Pontifical authority to the council.[576] Peter de Luna (Benedict XIII.)

[572] *Conc. Const.*, sess. xlv., pp. 746–748.

[573] "Quomodo et an liceat in causis fidei a summo Pontifice appellare" (in Op. cit., pt. i., p. 431, seq.).

[574] *Ibid.*, p. 437.

[575] *Conc. Const.*, sess. x. (Labbe, l. c., p. 175); et sess. xii., p. 214.

[576] *Conc. Const.*, sess. xiv. (Labbe, l. c., pp. 224-5).

alone was deposed at the close of the council, when he was openly guilty of schism and heresy, and the Church was already united under the new Pope, Martin V. In the sentence of deposition, De Luna is declared a schismatic and a heretic, rejected by God Himself, and cut off from the body of Christ.[577] If, then, the Fathers of Constance did not dare to treat even doubtful Pontiffs, in a time of schism, according to the maxims of the Articles of the Fourth and Fifth Sessions, how can we believe that they intended to enforce these very Articles as general rules for the Church in its normal state?

VII. It is true that the synod assembled at Basle (Dec. 14, 1431) not only renewed the Articles of Constance in the Second Session, but intended thus to assert against the legitimate Pontiff, Eugenius IV., its supremacy and independence in the Universal Church; nay, even pretended to make of them a matter of faith.[578] But first, before the synod had renewed these decrees in the Second Session, Eugenius IV., on December 10, 1431, had issued the bull of its dissolution;[579] so that Cardinal Julian, who had been appointed by the Pope president of the council,[580] in obedience to this new order of Eugenius, resigned his office.[581] Thus that decree was made without the concurrence of any representative of the Holy See; and, moreover, only by seven or eight prelates, who were then as-

[577] *Conc. Const.*, sess. xxxvii. (Labbe, l. c., pp. 681-2).

[578] *Concilium Basileense*, sess. ii., sess. xviii., et sess. xxiii. (Labbe, t. xvii., pp. 236, 305, 389). *Epist. Synodi Basileensis ad Oratores Principum* (l. c., p. 536, seq.).

[579] *Bulla Eugenii IV. de Revocatione Conc. Basileen.* (in App. v. ad *Conc. Basil.*, n. lii. Labbe, t. xvii., p. 733).

[580] *Litt. Eugenii IV. ad Card. Julianum* (in sess. i. Conc. Basil., l. c., p. 227).

[581] *In Bulla Retractationis Pii II.* (*In Collectione Monumentorum*, Op. L. Veith. *De Primatu Papæ*, p. 208.)

sembled at Basle, and who dared to brave the orders of the Head of the Church.[582] With regard to the Eighteenth Session, these Articles were not acknowledged by the legates of the Pope, of whom some were absent, and some protested against the decrees; if several signed them, they acted as private persons, to secure the honour of presiding in the council.[583] But not even then was the council lawfully assembled, for it had not complied with the conditions imposed by Pope Eugenius IV. in the bull by which he withdrew and cancelled the order of its dissolution. These conditions were: (1.) That all whatsoever had been either said or written in the synod against the authority of the Pope should be annulled; and (2.) that the Roman legates should be admitted to a *real* presidency of the council.[584] Now the synod not only did not annul the decrees against the authority of the Apostolic See, but it sanctioned them again and again, and proposed them as articles of faith. Moreover, it refused to allow the legates to exercise their full power,[585] imposing on them conditions most injurious to the Papal claims.[586] Thus it follows that even in the Eighteenth Session, when the decrees were renewed against the supreme authority of the Pope, the Synod of Basle was under the sentence of dissolution pronounced by Pope Euge-

[582] Vide Bullam cit. Pii II., l. c. *Litt. Eugenii IV. ad Conc. Basil.* (in App. ad hoc Conc., n. xlv.; vel in pt. i. *Conc. Florentini*, n. xiii. Labbe, t. xviii., p. 880, seq.). The Fathers of Basle confessed the smallness of their number in the *Resp. Synod.*, n. xvi., in Conc. Basil. (Labbe, t. xvii., p. 567).

[583] Turrecremata: *In Resp. ad Basileenses in Conc. Florent.*, pt. ii., n. 19 (Labbe, t. xviii., p. 1480).

[584] Vide *Bullam Eugenii IV.*, in sess. xvi. *Conc. Basil.* (Labbe, t. xvii., p. 292, seq.). Turrecremata: l. c., n. 18 (Labbe, t. xviii).

[585] *Conc. Basil.*, sess. xvii. (Labbe, t. xvii., p. 304). Turrecremata: l. c.

[586] L. c.

nius in the Bull of December 18, 1431. All know what was the miserable end of that synod; it went so far in its overbearing rashness as to impeach the Pope himself (July 31, 1437);[587] to pronounce upon him, first, a sentence of suspension (January 24, 1438),[588] and at length a final sentence of deposition (May 25, 1439).[589] But its vote, and its Anti-Pope Felix V., met with nothing but contempt from the Catholic world, already wearied by the long schism healed at Constance. Princes and people took no notice of the decrees of Basle, but adhered to Eugenius IV., the real head of the Church, the true representative of Christ, apart from whom no council invested with supreme authority can exist. Anglicans should remember that at that period—that is, half a century before the great apostacy of Protestantism—England declared itself for Pope Eugenius and his supremacy, against the authority of the council. Henry VI., then King of England, rebuked in severe terms the Assembly of Basle for having shown such rashness as to judge the Sovereign Pontiff and cause the good to fear lest the day of Antichrist were at hand. And he ordered that, in spite of its decrees, the annates should be paid to Pope Eugenius.[590] The Bishops of England firmly resolved that should the Synod of Basle choose a new Pope, they would adhere to Eugenius IV., and obey his orders.[591] And they refused to acknow-

[587] *Conc. Basil.*, sess. xxvi. (Labbe, t. xvii., p. 349, seq.).

[588] *Conc. Basil.*, sess. xxxi. (Labbe, t. xvii., p. 376, seq.).

[589] *Conc. Basil.*, sess. xxxiv. (Labbe, l. c., p. 390, seq.).

[590] Patricius: *Hist. Conc. Basil. et Florent.*, n. lxxii. (in Labbe, t. xviii., p. 1368); et in *Actis Conc. Florent.* (l. c., p. 873).

[591] *Convocatio Prælat. et Cleri in Ecclesia S. Pauli.* London, A.D. 1433. (In *Actis Conc. Brit.*, A. Wilkins, t. iii., pp. 521-2.) The question proposed in that synod was—"Si procedatur per concilium (Basileense) quod absit, ad electionem novi Summi Pontificis, numquid obedietur domino nostro Papæ moderno, aut

ledge Felix V., the nominee of the Council of Basle. All this evidently shows how deep was the conviction in England, as well as in the whole Catholic world, that the Pope is, by divine institution, superior to all bishops, whether dispersed throughout the Church, or assembled in general council; and in the Œcumenical Synod of Florence, the Catholic doctrine was solemnly affirmed, with the approval of all parties. Eugenius IV., with the full consent of the assembled Fathers, in his Bull *Moyses*, peremptorily condemned the errors of the Council of Basle regarding the authority of the Roman Pontiff.[592] Cardinal Turrecremata expressed the same view when, in the name of the Pope, he answered the Orator of the Assembly of Basle at the Council of Florence. He proved most solidly that the Pope is superior to the general council, and that the Synod of Basle had misunderstood and misrepresented the meaning of the Articles of Constance.[593]

VIII. But further, in the decree of Union of the Churches of the East and West, the Council of Florence expressly acknowledges the supreme divine authority of the Pope over the whole Church to be a matter of faith. The definition of the Florentine Council on this point presents all the characters requisite to an œcu-

alteri sic per concilium eligendo, aut neutri eorum?" And the unanimous answer of the council was—"Conclusit clerus unanimiter quod domino nostro Papæ moderno tanquam vero et indubitato Sumno Pontifici, sicut in ipso præsenti tempore extitit obeditum, ita in futurum obediendum; nec esset obedientia suæ sanctitati debita quomodolibet subtrahenda," &c.

[592] *Bulla Moyses*, in Conc. Florent., pt. iii. (Labbe, t. xviii., p. 1202). "Constantiense Concilium in malum ac reprobum sensum et a sana doctrina penitus alienum pertrahunt," &c. (l. c., p. 1205).

[593] *Responsio Card. Turrecremata in Conc. Florentino ad Basileenses* (Labbe, t. xviii., p. 1428, seq.).

menical decree.[594] Some of the extreme Gallicans, as Launoy, do not number this synod among the general councils, whilst they blush not to give that name to the miserable conventicle of Basle. And they contest its legitimacy on the ground of its having met whilst the rival Synod of Basle was yet holding its sessions. But Natalis Alexander, himself a Gallican, has triumphantly proved this point against them;[595] and since we do not wish to go into the subject, we refer the reader to his work. The learned dissertation of the Dominican should be read by all who, like Mr. Palmer,[596] agree with Launoy; they will gain from it a just idea of the authority of the Council of Florence. We will proceed to examine the force of this council's definition concerning the supreme power of the Roman Pontiff. "We define," the Fathers declare, "that the holy Apostolic See, and the Roman Pontiff, possess the primacy over the whole world; that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, the true Vicar of Christ, the Head of the whole Church, the Father and Doctor of all Christians; further, that the full power of feeding, ruling, and guiding the Universal Church was entrusted to him, through blessed Peter,

[594] "Item definimus sanctam Apostolicam Sedem et Rom. Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum Pontificem Rom. successorem esse B. Petri Principis Apostolorum et verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiæ caput et omnium Christianorum Patrem et Doctorem existere; et ipsi in B. Petro pascendi regendi ac gubernandi Universalem Ecclesiam a Domino Nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse: quemadmodum etiam in gestis œcumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur."—*Conc. Flor.*, in sess. xxv., textus Græco-Latinus (Labbe, t. xviii., p. 526, seq.).

[595] Natalis Alexander: *Hist. Eccl.*, t. xviii., diss. x., art. i., p. 604. Edit. Mansi, 1790).

[596] Palmer: *Church of Christ*, vol. ii., pt. iv., c. xi., sec. v., p. 177.

by Jesus Christ our Lord, as is also contained in the œcumenical councils and in the sacred canons." This decree contains the final definition by the Council of Florence of the divine supremacy of the Roman Pontiff. The Pope is represented as the successor of St. Peter, as Vicar of Christ, as the head and the pastor of the whole Church, as the sovereign teacher of all Christians; his authority is considered to be in its nature full and supreme, in its extension universal, in its origin divine, being derived from Christ Himself. The meaning of this definition could not be misunderstood by the Eastern bishops and Patriarchs. About two centuries before the Council of Florence, the Greek Emperor Michael had fully admitted, in the name of his nation, the formulary of faith presented to him by Gregory X. in the Second Œcumenical Synod of Lyons, and in it he had plainly acknowledged that the Roman Pontiff was divinely entrusted with full and supreme authority over the whole Church; that all controversies of faith were to be settled by his judgment; that all persons were free to appeal to him from any Church tribunal whatever; that all the privileges of the other sees, and especially of those of Patriarchal dignity, were to be ascribed to a concession by the See of Rome, the prerogative of which was always to be maintained in the general councils, as well as in all other circumstances.[597] This formulary received the signatures of all the Greek bishops. In the meetings held at Florence by the Eastern bishops for the purpose of coming to an agreement concerning the authority of the Pope, they had required two conditions from the Holy See—first, that the Pope should not assemble any general council without the previous consent of the Greek Emperor

[597] *Litteræ Michaelis Palæologi Imp. ad Gregorium X.*, in Conc. Lugd. ii. (Labbe, t. xiv., p. 512).

and the Patriarchs; secondly, that in case of appeal to Rome against a sentence of a Patriarch, the latter should not be obliged to appear at Rome before the tribunal of the Pope. But Eugenius IV. declined to admit either of these conditions; he explicitly declared that he would maintain the authority which he had received from Christ, to which even the Patriarchs were subject. Thereupon the Emperor and the Greek prelates, after some difficulty and hesitation, finally complied with the will of the Pontiff, and acknowledged his full authority over the Universal Church.[593] Thus, in the Synod of Florence, the Greek no less than the Latin Church confessed as a dogma of faith the divine supremacy of the Roman Pontiff. They therefore condemned the error that the authority of the Pope over the whole Church is not *juris divini*, or that it is derived from the Church itself; for it would be absurd to suppose that the Pope, who is by divine institution the head and the teacher of the whole Church, regards his own authority as received from that very Church. Hence, although the Council of Florence did not explicitly define the superiority of the Pope to the general council, still it implied this superiority by necessary consequence, for it defined his authority in an absolute manner, excluding every limitation of it, and deriving it from the institution of God Himself. How then can the council be supposed to have adjudged that the divinely appointed head of the Church should be subject to the general assembly of the bishops, who, without the Pope, cannot represent the Universal Church? How could the council believe that the divinely-established pastor of the whole flock of Christ—people and bishops—should be fed by the

[593] *Acta Græco-Latina Conc. Florentini*, sess. xxv. (Labbe, t. xviii., pp. 514—517).

bishops in a general meeting? Hence the Synod of Florence listened, without protest, to the oration delivered by John, provincial of the Dominicans, in which he plainly stated that the Pope, as the head, the pastor, the teacher, and the ruler of the Universal Church, is superior to the bishops assembled in synod.[599] They, moreover, evinced no surprise when Turrecremata inculcated the same doctrine in still more explicit terms in the answer addressed to the deputies from Basle.[600] The Fathers of Florence, though they felt that the Pope was of necessity superior to the council, did not express that doctrine in an explicit form in their definitions of faith, out of deference to the suggestions of prudence, on account of the schismatical behaviour of the Assembly of Basle. The ultra-Gallicans were well aware of this, and on that account endeavoured to disprove the œcumenical character of the Council of Florence, that so they might lessen the authority of those maxims, which they knew to be contrary to the second of the Articles of 1682.

IX. After all we have said, it is easy to clear away the difficulty which Gallicans and Protestants attempt to found on the last words of the foregoing passage—"Quemadmodum etiam in gestis œcumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur." They maintain that by these words the Council of Florence asserted the subordination of the Pope to the bishops assembled in a general synod, and his consequent subjection to the laws which they should enact. For this purpose they have recourse to the Greek text, in which the words καθ' ὃν τρόπον καί κ. τ. λ. seem to them to bear a meaning at variance with the Latin text and with

[599] *Joan. Prov. Disputatio de Primatu Papæ*, collat. xxii. Conc. Florentini, Act. Latina (Labbe, t. xviii., p. 1156).

[600] *Responsio Card. Turrecremata ad Basileenses*, pt. ii. (Labbe, t. xviii., p. 1476, seq.).

the common Catholic doctrine. But they are grossly mistaken; for, in the first place, the original text of the decree of union was not, properly speaking, in Greek, but in Latin. The Latin text approved by the Pope was laid before the Greek Emperor, Patriarchs, and bishops. It was afterwards translated into Greek, copied and read aloud in both languages in the council, and then signed by the Pope, the Emperor, and all the bishops both of the Latin and the Greek Churches.[601] Therefore, although the Greek as well as the Latin text may thus be regarded as original, yet the Greek is to be explained by the Latin rather than the Latin by the Greek. Now the Latin text is inconsistent with the interpretation devised by the author of the *Defensio Decl. Cleri Gallicani*,[602] and adopted by Protestants. But, omitting this consideration, does the meaning of καθ' ὃν τρόπον καί differ from the *quemadmodum etiam* of the Latin text? By no means. But as clear proofs of this have been again and again adduced by numerous writers, it would be useless to spend time in solving a difficulty which a very small amount of Greek scholarship shows to be of no weight. The Acts themselves of the Florentine Council fully show that the expression καθ' ὃν τρόπον καί of the Greek text cannot have any meaning different from that of *quemadmodum etiam* in the Latin. For the Byzantine Emperor and the Greek bishops by the use of that expression did not contemplate putting the slightest limit to the authority of the Pope, but wished to point out the trustworthy historical evidences by which it was to be confirmed and explained. It was the Latins who had inserted the final clause—"Quemadmodum definiunt scripturæ sacræ et dicta sanctorum." But an objection being

601 Labbe, l. c., p. 1183.

602 Bossuet: l. vi., c. xi. (Op., vol. vii., p. 295, seq. Paris, 1863).

raised by the Greeks to the *dicta sanctorum*, the Latins, in order to remove any difficulty in the way of union, agreed to substitute—"Quemadmodum etiam in gestis œcumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus legitur;" for the words and the acts of the general councils, in addition to their force as *dicta Sanctorum Patrum*, have a more decisive authority in illustration and confirmation of the prerogatives of the Pope.[603]

X. The Council of Florence then, in accordance with all the earlier œcumenical synods, unequivocally acknowledged the supreme and absolute authority of the Roman Pontiff. That synod, as we have before remarked, asserted and confirmed his superiority to the general council, although it did not insert in the decree of union an explicit definition of this prerogative. No doubt then can remain that the self-contradictory error of the Gallicans as to the superiority of the council over the Pope, was, as we observed above, of recent origin, whilst the contrary doctrine had its roots deep in the Church and rested on the ground of divine revelation. The acts of the first eight councils afford a plain proof of our assertion, as the learned Ballerini have solidly demonstrated.[604] But we need not proceed further with this question, especially since in the second part of our work we shall have occasion to treat the subject anew, when we shall speak of the infallibility of the Pope. For the present we will only remark that the maxim held by all antiquity was, that no general synod could have any authority except it were confirmed by the sanction of the Roman Pontiff. This principle is plainly affirmed by the Greek historians Socrates and Sozomen, and even by the schismatic Nicephorus, as

[603] *Acta Græco-Latina Conc. Florentini*, sess. xxv. (Labbe, t. xviii., p. 518).

[604] Ballerini: *De Potestate Eccl. Summorum Pontificum et Concil. Generalium*, c. v., sec. 1, p. 67, seq. Aug. Vindel., 1770.

also in the Acts of the Œcumenical Councils of Ephesus, Chalcedon, and others. But it would be useless in this place to reproduce documents, which have been quoted by so many writers, as for instance by Charlas,[605] Zaccaria,[606] and especially Cardinal Orsi, who, in his erudite work on the power of the Pope over general synods, has fully and triumphantly refuted the errors of the author of the *Defensio Decl. Cleri Gallicani.*[607] The principal proofs of our doctrine are given in even the ordinary courses of dogmatic theology;[608] so that it were needless to repeat here what may be seen in works which are in the hands of everyone. We will confine ourselves to pointing out that, if Gallicanism is now nearly extinct in the Church of France, the reason is found in the conviction of the clergy of that Catholic country that these opinions had their roots in the despotism of the civil power over the Church, and their fruit in the servitude of the Church to the civil power. It has been clearly understood that the maxims of Gallicanism have never been the doctrines of antiquity, even in the Church of France. Half a century before the Assembly of 1682, all the bishops of France, assembled in a general synod, had clearly expressed their deep conviction upon the subject. "The bishops," they said, "shall also reverence our holy Father the Pope, the visible head of the Universal Church, the

[605] Charlas: *De Libertatibus Eccl. Gallic.*, l. v., c. ix., p. 261, seq. Leodii, 1684.

[606] Zaccaria: *Antifebronio*, t. iv., l. iv., pp. 1—201. Cesena, 1770. *Antifebronius Vindicatus*, pt. ii., diss. iv., capp. v.—viii., pp. 88—197. Cæsenæ, 1771.

[607] Orsi: *De Rom. Pontificis Auctoritate in Synodos Œcumenicas*, l. vii., c. iv., t. ii., p. 155, seq. Romæ, 1771.

[608] See Kilber: *Principia Theologica*, disput. ii., c. iii., art. iii. (in *Theolog. Dogm. Wirceburgensi*, t. i., pt. i., p. 311, seq. Parisiis, 1852). Perrone: *Prælect. Theol.*, vol. viii., pt. i., sec. ii., c. iii., prop. ii., p. 431, seq. Lovanii, 1843.

Vicar of God on earth, the bishop of bishops and patriarchs; in a word, the successor of St. Peter, from whom the apostleship and the episcopacy had their beginning, and upon whom Jesus Christ founded His Church, by delivering to him the keys of heaven, with infallibility in faith, which in his successors we have seen miraculously endure without change to the present day."[609] Such were the sentiments of the French clergy before the Assembly of 1682; and very many similar quotations might be adduced. But we need not repeat the arguments which have been so well put by others. We, therefore, invite all honest Protestants to apply for further proofs to Kilber,[610] Andruzzi,[611] Petitdidier,[612] Charlas,[613] Sfondrati,[614] and Soardi,[615] who have treated the question at greater length than we have done. Their learned writings will spare us the labour of extending further this first part of our work.

XI. We trust that what we have said has been sufficient to show that neither in antiquity, nor even in the Decrees of Constance, can any support be found for the erroneous opinion of the superiority of the general council to the Pope. That opinion evidently comprises in itself all the elements of schism and heresy; and it was adopted in the French Church at a time

[609] *In Monitis ad Archiep. et Epp.*, A.D. 1626. Penes Kilber: *De sensu Eccl. Gallicanæ*, Veith. De Primat. Papæ (in Coll. Mon., p. 251. Mechliniæ, 1824).

[610] Kilber: Op. cit., l. c., p. 248, seq.

[611] Andruzzi: *De Perpetua Ecclesiæ Doctrina de Infall. Papæ*, l. ii., capp. i., ii., iii., pp. 121—149. Bononiæ, 1720.

[612] Petitdidier: *Traité Théologique sur l'Autorité et l'Infall. des Papes*, c. xiv. Luxemburg, p. 348, seq.

[613] Charlas: Op. cit., l. ii., c. xiii., p. 146, seq.

[614] Sfondrati: *Gallia Vindicata*, diss. iii., sec. vi., p. 668, seq. Edit. 1702.

[615] Soardi: *De Rom. Pontificis Auctoritate Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ Sententia*, l. iv., c. iii., p. 108, seq.

when that Church was verging upon schism and heresy, under the influence of the erroneous system of the so-called Gallican Liberties, the tendency of which is in itself schismatical and heretical. But the more the French Church faithfully adhered to Catholic principles, the more decidedly did it reject the schismatical maxims which it had adopted in compliance with the will of an imperious prince wounded in his pride and ambition. The French Church, both before and after the Assembly of 1682, and especially in our own age, has solemnly acknowledged the independence of the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff of any synod, and its superiority to all general assemblies of bishops. Those retrograde spirits who still persist in defending a system which has no meaning in our time are few in the France of the nineteenth century, and they are found nowhere but among the courtiers of an empire which emulates the greatness of Louis XIV., or among that class of clergy who see no other way open to dignities and to the patronage of the civil power save the course of adulation and court intrigue, to the prejudice of ecclesiastical authority.

CONCLUSION.

ANGLICANISM: ITS ORIGIN, NATURE, AND EFFECTS—ONLY REMEDY FOR ITS EVILS.

I. THE High Church party in England is, in our days, more than ever looking and longing for communion with that Roman Church which the Anglican divines for three centuries stigmatised as tainted with schism and heresy. But while aiming at union, they are filled with alarm at the prospect of what they call the practical system of Papal authority being forced again upon this country: they protest against the power which was exercised by Rome in olden times; to this they attribute the schism of the East, and the isolated condition of the Anglican Establishment; they assert that without limitation and curtailment of the Papal authority, no basis can be laid for their reconciliation and communion with Rome.[616] After what has been said in the foregoing sections, we have no need to examine what retrenchment and limitation of Papal prerogative they demand. For beyond all doubt, should the principle of episcopal independence, as set forth in the Anglican system,[617] be maintained, Papal authority would not only be limited in its claims and jurisdiction, but utterly overthrown and annihilated. The proposal to introduce limitations of the excessive power of the Pope as a means to facilitate reunion in the Universal Church,

[616] This proposal has been made more than once in the Church of England.—See, for instance, Bramhall: *Vindication of the Church of England*, disc. ii., c. x. (Op., t. i., p. 279. Edit. Oxford).

[617] See Introductory Chapter, n. iii., p. 3, seq.

has been a constant pretext put forward by heretics and schismatics in every age, with the view of justifying their apostacy and their obstinacy in separation from Rome. But no schism or heresy, ancient or modern, ever originated in the exaggerated prerogative of the Roman Pontiff. We have given a sufficient sketch of the true causes of the Eastern schism, which the High Church writers so obstinately ascribe to the encroachments of Papal authority.[618] Those who rely on historical evidence, should not remain ignorant that the Photian system sprang from a spirit of ambition and violence, which shook off the control of authority that it might rush unbridled into disorder. This spirit has survived the Eastern schism. The utter depravity into which the Greek clergy of Constantinople have sunk, and the abuse and cruelty found in the exercise of their temporal power over the Christians of their communion, may well account in our days for the obstinacy of their separation from the centre of Catholicism.[619] So that the stereotyped assertion of Protestant disputants will fail in its object of distorting historical evidence, and misleading those who view public events by the medium of light derived from these writers.

II. It is especially asserted that the excessive and tyrannical authority of the Popes caused the great apostacy of the sixteenth century in Europe. This view, so generally maintained by Protestants, is utterly false. We have at hand the authoritative testimony of a writer above all suspicion. "Il n' est pas vrai," says M. Guizot, "qu' au seizième siècle la cour de Rome fût tyrannique ; il n' est pas vrai que les abus proprement dits y fussent plus nombreux, plus crians qu'ils

[618] See section v. of this book, n. viii., p. 128, seq.

[619] On this matter consult the work of J. G. Pitzipios, *L'Eglise Orientale*, pt. iii., chs. ii., iv., pp. 88, 134, seq. Rome, 1855.

n'avaient été dans d'autres temps. Jamais peut-être, au contraire, le gouvernement ecclésiastique n'avait été plus facile, plus tolérant, plus disposé à laisser aller toutes choses."[620] And with regard to the Anglican schism, the same publicist wrote as follows: "La révolution religieuse ne s'accomplit point en Angleterre comme sur le continent; elle y fut l'œuvre des rois eux-mêmes . . . le pouvoir se fit révolutionnaire."[621] Yes, the Anglican schism was not the work of the English Church, but of a tyrannical king, who was determined to enslave both Church and State, to secure the full indulgence of his monstrous licentiousness and unbridled ambition. Dr. Pusey, in his *Eirenicon*, shows some embarrassment when speaking of the origin of the Anglican schism. He endeavours to prove, after his manner, that in the fourteenth century the power of Rome had become exorbitant, and that the reforms so much needed at the close of the Western schism were constantly delayed; he then continues, "And if—after the Pope had not only excommunicated King Henry VIII., but had deposed him, deprived his future children, given away his dominions, laid the kingdom under an interdict, absolved his subjects from allegiance, and stirred up other princes against them if they rebelled not, given them to be slaves to their captors, and their property to be a spoil—the Church of England reformed herself, it was allowed to a provincial council to make decrees in matters of faith, subject to the ultimate authority of the Universal Church."[622] We do not intend to point out each and every misstatement contained in this extract; we limit

[620] Guizot: *Hist. de la Civilisation en Europe*, leç. xii., p. 341. Bruxelles, 1838.

[621] *Ibid.*, Op. cit., leç. xiii., p. 358.

[622] *Eirenicon*, p. 80.

our remarks to two points only, which are more immediately connected with our subject. First, Dr. Pusey represents the apostacy of the Anglican Church in the sixteenth century as a consequence of enormities perpetrated by the Pope against King Henry VIII.; secondly, he asserts that the Church of England of that age reformed herself. Now the Regius Professor of Hebrew seems to have forgotten the history of his own country, so far is he carried away by the errors and the prejudices of previous writers. The bull of Paul III., to which allusion is manifestly made in the foregoing passage, bears date August, 1535, while Henry VIII. had already, as early as 1531, transferred to the crown the Papal prerogatives, and set up an ecclesiastical supremacy in his own person.[623] Long before the bull of Paul III., Henry VIII. had conceived the ambitious design of following the Machiavellian counsels suggested to him by Cromwell, and precipitating his kingdom into the crime of apostacy.[624] We read in Collier: "Having got the clergy entangled in a *præmunire*, he (Henry) resolved to seize the juncture, and press the advantage."[625] In fact, a form of submission was then forced upon the clergy in Convocation, by which they were to recognise King Henry as supreme head of the Church of England, in order to be discharged of the consequences of the *præmunire*.[626] Bishop Tunstal and others, at the head of the Convocation of York, protested against these measures, which, by threats, had been

[623] The Bull of Pope Paul III. in Wilkins (*Conc. Britannica*, vol. iii., p. 792). Collier: *Ecclesiastical History*, pt. ii., bk. i., pp. 61, 62.

[624] Card. Pole: *Apologia ad Carolum V.*, nn. xxvii., xxviii. (Op., t. i., p. 118, seq. Brixiæ).

[625] Collier, l. c., p. 62.

[626] Collier: l. c. Dodd: *Church History*, vol. i., pt. i., art. iii., p. 234, seq. London, 1839.

imposed upon the Church of England;[627] but they did not know, as Dodd well remarks, "That the declaration of the King's headship was a step towards discarding the Papal supremacy."[628] It was as early as 1534, a whole year before the above-mentioned bull, that Henry VIII. proclaimed, in unmistakable terms, his absolute ecclesiastical supremacy, as being the fountain of all authority, both temporal and spiritual, declared the power of the Pope to be a mere usurpation, and abolished it in its name, title, and jurisdiction.[629] The Convocation of the time, like a flock of scared sheep, submitted to the imperious will of the tyrant; bishops and abbots lent their authority to the act of apostacy, and signed the royal proclamation; the University of Oxford, which had so lately joined with the selfsame king in defending against Luther and his followers the supremacy of the Pope, now took part in this ignominious act. Finally, Parliament passed the bill abrogating the Papal supremacy, recognising the like supremacy as part of the royal prerogative, and declaring guilty of treason all those who opposed the statute. Thus, before Paul III. had fulminated his anathema against the royal apostate, the Church of England had torn itself from the centre of Catholic unity, and entered on the downward path of schism and heresy. Such is the plain history of those times, which English writers misrepresent, in order to clear their country from the charge of schism.[630] The English Church was not impelled to deny the Papal supremacy and to assert its own independence out of love for its king, nor

[627] See his Protest in Wilkins (*Conc. Brit.*, vol. iii., p. 745).

[628] Dodd: l. c., p. 234.

[629] The King's Proclamation, in Wilkins, l. c., p. 772.

[630] The various documents are quoted by Dodd in the above-mentioned place, and by Rev. M. A. Tierney in the notes to the article.

indignation at the manner in which he was treated by the bull of excommunication. The point was carried by bribery and intimidation. Although the far greater part of the nation, with the majority of the bishops and the clergy, wished to maintain the Papal supremacy, still, when constrained by the penalties of treason, they suffered themselves to be borne along by the stream; few were found like Cardinal Fisher and Sir Thomas More, the Lord High Chancellor, to set themselves courageously against the heretical pretensions of the royal tyrant, ready to suffer all risks rather than renounce their faith.[631] In a word, the religious revolution in England was the work, not of the clergy, but of the king alone. The history of the reigns of Edward VI. and Elizabeth serves only to confirm our assertion.

III. It is easy to refute the second assertion, above quoted, from Dr. Pusey. His language would lead to the belief that the Church of England, as soon as she had been emancipated from the heavy yoke of Rome, and had gained independence, introduced the needful reforms into her own body. There is not even the least ground for this statement. As long as the clergy of England were under the obedience of the Universal Pastor of the Church, they were able to act independently of the civil power in all matters purely spiritual, so far as even to meet and exercise the power

631 "The main body of the clergy was certainly very reluctant to tear themselves, at the pleasure of a disappointed monarch, in the most dangerous crisis of religion from the bosom of Catholic unity. They complied, indeed, with all the measures of Government, far more than men of rigid conscience could have endured to do; but many, who wanted the courage of More and Fisher, were not far removed from their way of thinking."—Hallam: *The Constitutional History of England*, t. i., c. ii., p. 93. London, 1832. Strype often expresses the same.

of making laws concerning faith and morals.[632] But no sooner were they forced to disclaim the supremacy of the Holy See, than they became a branch of the civil power, and slaves of the crown. The maxim which at that time guided the English Parliament was, that "an independent power in the clergy to make laws, though in matters purely spiritual, was prejudicial to the civil magistrate."[633] Hence the rights and independence of the clergy were so curtailed, their spirit so broken, that, in the forcible words of Mr. Hallam, "they became the most abject of Henry's vassals, and dared not offer any steady opposition to his caprice, even when it led him to make innovations in the essential parts of their religion."[634] The well-known formulary of the submission of the clergy to the King bears sufficient witness to what we assert.[635] But even that act of submission, though it enslaved the clergy, does not reveal their ignominy to the full. In order to fill the measure of their degradation, Henry named as his vicar-general Cromwell, a layman, a great enemy to the clergy and to religion in general, placing him at the head of Convocation, not only to preside over synods and other ecclesiastical assemblies, but also to reform both places and persons, to decree ecclesiastical censures against the contumacious, and to correct disorders by any other penalty determined by law.[636] All, archbishops and bishops, with the whole of their clergy, submitted like lambs to the utterances of Cromwell, learning from him

[632] Dodd: Op., and l. c., pp. 237-38. Lathbury: *History of the Convocation of the Church of England*, c. v., p. 110. London, 1842.

[633] Dodd: l. c., p. 238.

[634] Hallam: Op., and l. c., p. 110.

[635] *Instrumentum super submissione cleri coram domino Rege*, &c., in Wilkins (*Conc. Brit.*, vol. iii., p. 754, seq.).

[636] *Regis commissio constituens T. Cromwell vicarium-generalem*, in Wilkins (l. c., p. 784, seq.).

which festival days they were to observe, what prayers to say in their churches, what things to preach to their flocks, how to administer the sacrament of confession, how to regulate the worship of saints and their images, with many other points of a like nature.[637] Moreover, Cromwell, as vicar-general, was commissioned by the King to make a general visitation of the clergy, during the progress of which their powers were wholly suspended.[638] "In this manner," says Strype, "the King, taking all the episcopal jurisdiction and power into his hands for a time, and exercising the same, it might serve as a perpetual monument of his supremacy. And they, receiving their power again from the King, might recognise him for the spring and foundation of it."[639] Accordingly, a commission was issued, appointing each prelate a deputy of the King, and authorising him to exercise his spiritual jurisdiction in that capacity during the royal pleasure. But each bishop was informed that the authority granted to him belonged exclusively to the King, and that he was entrusted with it only because Cromwell, the royal vicar-general, was prevented, owing to the multiplicity of his affairs, from exercising it everywhere and in every instance.[640] Such

[637] *Injunction by Th. Cromwell, his Majesty's vicar-general*, in Wilkins (l. c., p. 815, seq.). "From that the clergy concluded," says Burnet, "that they were now to be slaves to the Lord Vicegerent."—*History of the Reformation*, t. i., pt. i., bk. iii., p. 365. London. Edit. of Nares.

[638] *Inhibitio pro visitatione*, in Wilkins (l. c., p. 197). See Strype: *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, vol. i., pt. i., c. xxix., p. 321. Oxford, 1822.

[639] Strype: Op. cit., l. c., p. 322; and App. of *Documents*, n. lvii., vol. i., pt. ii., p. 216, seq.

[640] "Quia tamen ipse Thomas Cromwell nostris et hujus regni nostri Angliæ tot et tam arduis negotiis adeo præpeditus existat, quod ad omnen jurisdictionem nobis ut supremo capiti hujusmodi competentem ubique locorum infra hoc regnum nostrum et præ-

was the abject state to which King Henry reduced the clergy of England, and from which they were unable to raise themselves. It is sheer trifling to represent these poor slaves of the crown as an independent body exercising a full power of reforming the Church by their own act and deed in those assemblies, in which they admitted the presidency of an infamous layman; yet the assumption of Dr. Pusey, of Mr. Palmer, and of other writers of the High Church Party, amounts to nothing short of this.

IV. Let us now examine the grounds of the assertion that the Church of England reformed herself by her own authority after the rejection of the Papal supremacy. King Henry and his successors, in virtue of the Statute of 1534, were invested with full power and authority "to redress, to reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, . . . whatsoever, the which, by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought or may lawfully be reformed." They were hereby constituted the fountain of all jurisdiction. The bishops were appointed their deputies, to exercise a power which could not be exercised by the King's vicar-general on account of the multiplicity of his affairs. And what are the principal instruments of reformation during Henry's reign, which Mr. Palmer deems "very little inferior in importance to that made in Edward's reign?"[641] Mr. Palmer points out princi-

sertim in his quæ moram commode non patiuntur, aut sine subditorum nostrorum injuria differri non possunt, in sua persona expediendis non sufficiet; nos hujus in hac parte supplicationibus inclinati, et nostrorum subditorum commodis consulere cupientes, tibi vices nostras, sub modo et forma inferius descriptos, committendas fore, teque licentiandum esse decrevimus," &c.—*Commissio a Rege data pro jurisdictione episcopali*, in Wilkins (l. c., p. 798).

[641] Palmer: *Church of Christ*, pt. ii., c. vii., vol. i., p. 386. 3rd edition. London.

pally the following: the so-called *Articles of Faith*, the *Injunctions* of Cromwell, the *Institution of a Christian Man*, and the *Necessary Doctrine and Erudition.* But who does not know that the whole authority of those documents rests merely on the King's prerogative and sanction? Henry VIII., after having usurped the Papal supremacy, had already, even before 1536, done many things tending to advance the Reformation without so much as consulting Convocation.[642] In that year he devised certain *Articles of Faith* as necessary to be maintained by all in order to restore unity among the dissident factions of the kingdom.[643] These were presented by Cromwell to Convocation. "But probably," we learn from Lathbury, "nothing more was done by the bishops and clergy than to hear them read and give their assent."[644] At all events, the *Articles* were published by royal authority,[645] and were speedily followed by the King's *Injunctions to the Bishops concerning their Preaching.*[646] The *Injunctions* of Cromwell are manifestly orders which he, the King's vicar-general, gave the bishops, without requiring their consent and sanction. Yet Mr. Palmer gives this as his principal proof of the important reformation carried out by the authority of the English Church under Henry VIII.[647] As to the *Institution of a Christian Man*, it is true that it was drawn up in Convocation, and was therefore

[642] Lathbury: Op. cit., c. vi., p. 128. Strype: Op. cit., vol. i., pt. i., c. xxxi., p. 335, seq.

[643] Burnet: *Hist. of Ref.*, l. c., p. 345. Collier: *Eccl. Hist.*, vol. i., pt. ii., bk. ii., p. 122. Strype: *Mem.*, vol. i., pt. i., c. xxxix., p. 466.

[644] Lathbury: *Hist. of the Conv.*, c. vi., p. 131.

[645] See those Articles in Collier, l. c.; Burnet, l. c.; Wilkins, l. c., p. 817, seq.

[646] Burnet: l. c., p. 363, seq. Wilkins, l. c., pp. 813, 825.

[647] Palmer: *Church of Christ*, vol. i., pt. ii., c. vii., p. 386, seq.

called the *Book of the Bishops.*[648] But we must remark, (1.) that the King issued a commission to divers bishops for compiling that book;[649] (2.) that the book, though revealing a tendency to further the cause of the Reformation, still contained every doctrine set forth in the *Book of the Articles* and in that of the *Injunctions* addressed by Henry and Cromwell to the bishops; (3.) from the Preface of that book, dedicated to the King, we may well understand what degree of authority for reforming the Church the clergy of England in Convocation attributed to themselves under Henry VIII. After having fulfilled their commission, they apply to the King, "most humbly beseeching the same to permit and suffer it in case it shall be so thought mete to his moste excellent wisdom, to be printed, and so with his supreme power set forth and commanded to be taught. . . . Without the which power and licence of your Majestie, we know and confess, that we have none authority either to assemble ourselves together for any pretence or purpose or to publish anything that might be by us agreed on and compyled."[650] Nor was the King's permission requested merely as a matter of form, but as a sanction of the doctrine proposed and explained in the book. In fact, they conclude the address by saying: "We moste humbly submitte (the book) to the moste excellent wisdom and exact judgment of your majestie, to be recognised, overseen, and corrected, if your grace shall find any word or sentence in it mete to be changed, qualified, or further expounded . . . whereunto we shall in that case conform ourselves, as to our moste bounden duties, to God and to your

[648] Collier: Op. cit., pt. ii., bk. ii., p. 139.

[649] Strype: *Mem.*, vol. i., pt. i., c. xli., p. 485.

[650] The Convocation's Preface, in Wilkins (Op. cit., l. c., p. 831).

highness, appertaineth."[651] Thus, not the clergy, but the king, was the reformer both of the clergy and of the Church. In a word, the clergy in Convocation were the humble sycophants of King Henry, ready to sacrifice any point of the Catholic doctrine, or even their own heretical opinions, in order to please their master. It was two years after the publication of the *Institution of a Christian Man*, wherein they had tried to suppress the doctrine, and the truth itself, of "Transubstantiation," and to encourage the movement of the reformation, that they approved in Convocation of the famous *Six Articles* the first of which was an explicit and definitive sanction of Transubstantiation as an article of faith; nor were the other articles less calculated to check the tendency towards Protestantism, and to strike terror into its partisans.[652] The English clergy submitted to the will of Henry, to which they were enslaved. Finally, in 1543, the *Institution of a Christian Man* was altered in its form and in its doctrine, and moulded into another work set forth by the authority of the King. The title was, *A necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man set forth by the King's Majesty of England.*[653] It was therefore styled the *King's Book*. Now, although in this work the article of the *Institution* concerning purgatory was wholly omitted, and other doctrines and rites either called into question or rejected, for it was, indeed, a further step to reformation;[654] nevertheless, "Where the *Erudition*," says Collier, "differs from the *Institution*, it seems mostly to lose ground—to go off from the

[651] L. c.

[652] See the *Statute of the Six Articles*, st. 31 Henry VIII., c. 14. See Wilkins, t. iii., p. 848, seq.; and Dodd, Op. cit., vol. i., Append., p. 442—449.

[653] See Collier: Op. cit., pt. ii., bk. ii., p. 189—191.

[654] Strype: *Memorials*, vol. i., pt. i., c. l., p. 589.

primitive plan, and reform backwards."[655] But this new step, whatever its tendency may have been, was certainly brought about by the power of the King, who had gathered up and centred in himself the whole authority of altering, changing, and reforming the symbol, the discipline, and the rites of the Anglican Church; of prescribing the prayers to be said privately by the people;[656] of decreeing new saints' days, or abrogating other holy days,[657] and even of granting licence to preach,[658] or dispensation to eat white meats during Lent.[659] In a word, it is by no means true that the Church of England reformed herself; but it was the King who shaped her according to his interest and caprice by the shameful exercise of his usurped power.[660]

V. It is needless to continue this subject in further justification of the judgment formed on the religious revolution by M. Guizot after an unprejudiced consideration of the reign of Henry VIII. From what we have said we may safely conclude that it is a mere calumny to assert that the excessive power of the Popedom, by which the national clergy were deprived

[655] Collier: l. c.

[656] See the Preface made by the King to his Premier, in Wilkins, l. c., p. 873.

[657] In Wilkins, l. c., pp. 823, 824, 859.

[658] The form of that licence may be found in Collier, Op. cit., l. c., p. 143.

[659] In Wilkins, l. c., p. 867. Edward VI. granted a dispensation to Archbishop Cranmer, to the Bishop of Exeter, and others, to eat flesh meat during Lent. The documents in Dodsworth, *Anglicanism considered in its results*, n. iv., p. 58, note. London, 1851.

[660] On this point Dr. Overbeck is right in saying, "The English people never introduced the Reformation. It was imposed upon them, and so to say, *octroyée*, by unprincipled tyrants, supported by a handful of innovators. But in spite of tyranny and persecution, the English would not part with their Church," &c.—*Catholic Orthodoxy*, p. 114.

of their authority, was the principal cause of the religious revolution of this kingdom. Meanwhile, it is true that the more a nation separates itself from the Roman centre of unity, either by schism or by heresy, the more repugnance does it feel in again submitting itself to that supreme authority which rules over the whole Church. It is in the very nature of schism to hate the authority which is its antagonist; and it is natural for heresy to protest against that power which in every age victoriously combats and infallibly destroys it. The Papal supremacy was instituted by Christ for the very purpose of preserving the Church from schism and heresy; schism and heresy must therefore be its mortal enemies as long as it preserves the character conferred upon it in its original institution. For this reason, we are not surprised that all nations which have been torn from the centre of Catholic unity dread the Papacy, and regard it as the principal cause of their separation. Nor can we wonder that Elias Meniates, Bishop of Zerniza, should have asserted that the controversy concerning the sovereignty of the Pope is the great wall of separation which divides the Greek and Latin Churches.[661] When we consider the present situation of the Greek and Protestant communions, we see that this assertion could be safely made with regard to each of them, for abhorrence and hatred of the Papacy are the necessary offspring of schism and heresy; and the more obstinately a nation retains its rebellious attitude, the more deeply will these feelings take root in its heart. What marvel, then, if the Papacy is regarded as a stumbling-block, and the cause of isolation? Mr. Palmer holds a very singular opinion on this subject: "The principle of *obedience to the Roman Pontiff*, as the true test of Catholic unity, was," he tells us, "a principle

[661] In Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*, p. 63.

tending to schism." As the ground of this view, he states, that this principle is not only not taught by the Gospel, but that, "It interrupted the communion of the Church, whenever any Church refused to submit to the unjust pretensions of the Roman See."[662] By this very strange mode of reasoning, we might get rid of the principle of obedience even to individual bishops, and to the national synods, on which Mr. Palmer so strongly insists.[663] We might turn the author's argument against himself, using his own words. "The principle of obedience to individual bishops, and to the synod, as a true test of Catholic unity, is a principle tending to schism, because it interrupts communion whenever any individual refuses to submit to the unjust pretension of his bishop, or of the synod." If, as Mr. Palmer holds, the Pope is not infallible and the general council of the Church may err, much less is each bishop or each particular synod infallible, especially when acting in subservience to the civil power. If unjust pretensions can be urged by the Roman See, each and every bishop and synod of England can be guilty of the same fault. Consequently, according to this principle, the ultra-democratic form of government would be that best adapted to the Church of Christ, in order that all possible causes of schism and separation might be avoided. Mr. Palmer must surely have forgotten the unanimous teaching of the Fathers of the Church—that as the bishop is appointed to be the centre of each diocese, in order to prevent any schism within it, for the same reason is the Pope appointed to be the centre of the Universal Church. The proof of this assertion will be found in the first section of this work.

VI. Finally, let us ask ourselves what were in

[662] Palmer: *Church of Christ*, pt. ii., c. ii., n. x., vol. i., p. 346.
[663] *Ibid.*, Op. cit., pt. i., c. iv., sec. ii., p. 38, seq.

England the consequences of separation from the centre of Catholic unity? An endless multiplication of schisms, an enormous increase of errors and heresies, an outpouring and spread of infidelity in the pale of the Anglican establishment itself. There is no city, no small town even, in which we could not number by the dozen the distinct communions which, in the midst of mutual strife, emulate each other in propagating the most absurd errors and heresies. The Established Church is now far from embracing the major part of the population, so great has been the spread of dissent and infidelity, and in this very Establishment, it would not be easy to find two or three bishops agreeing in the same doctrines of faith. Such is the tough and vigorous life of the Church of England, of which Dr. Pusey speaks so boastfully;[664] such its career upon the whole; such the way it has been moving along these three hundred years; a life and a way of errors and heresies; moving from Catholicism to Calvinism, from Calvinism to Sabellianism, Unitarianism, Latitudinarianism, to and fro, amidst all kinds of error. Such is the path in which Anglican divines have been walking for three centuries, and such is the evidence of their alleged orthodoxy.[665] "Where does the Church of England find itself at the end?" asks Dr. Pusey.[666] We answer, in the words of Dr. Overbeck, "At an unfathomable precipice."[667] The learned professor of Hebrew does not deny that "Rejection of Catholicism

[664] *Eirenicon*, p. 283.

[665] See *The Variations in the Church established by Law.* London, 1846. Macaulay: *Essays*, vol. ii., on Gladstone, pp. 485—89. London, 1844. Dr. Ward: *Anglican Establishment contrasted with the Catholic Church of every age*, n. iv., p. 23, seq. London, 1856.

[666] *Eirenicon*, p. 277.

[667] *Catholic Orthodoxy*, p. 85.

ends, in the long run, in Rationalism, and that it is an inclined plane, on which generations cannot stand."[668] He confesses that, "We have seen the truth of this in Lutheranism and Calvinism, in the length and breadth of the land which they occupied."[669] But how can he make exception of the Anglican Church? How can he assert that after more than three centuries, it alone has a more vigorous life than ever? The Church of England, in truth, consummated its rejection of Catholicism when it disowned the divine supremacy of the Pope, and yielded to the teaching of foreign reformers, who sapped by degrees the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic Church. It is no less strange that Dr. Pusey should exempt the Anglican Establishment from all responsibility in connection with the errors of those numerous sects which have revolted from it.[670] Was it not the Establishment that opened up among the English people the great source of schism and heresy? Was it not the Establishment that gave birth to Latitudinarianism, to the principles of the "Broad Church" party, the next step to which is Rationalism? Yes, the Anglican Church was the great rebel of the sixteenth century, who, by rebellion, inflicted on herself a mortal blow. By disgraceful submission to the spiritual supremacy of the King, it utterly destroyed its vital principle, and became a mere function of the civil power. Nevertheless, from 1534 to 1717, it had preserved a phantom existence as a Church, although unable, without a royal licence, to meet in synod, to make new canons, to pass any censure upon irreligious books, to condemn a heresy, to proclaim a Catholic doctrine. But from that year, after the Bangorian controversy, even that shadow of

[668] *Eirenicon*, p. 283.
[669] *Ibid.*, p. 284. [670] L. c.

life vanished.[671] At present, although convocation meets with every Parliament, the meeting is a mere formality, and serves no purpose but that of a corpse, proving the previous existence of a life which has now departed.

VII. And so shall it be until the English nation shall again proclaim, as did their ancestors for more than a thousand years, that the Pope is the pastor of all pastors, the supreme head of the whole Church, his See the See of St. Peter, on which the great Apostle still continues to sit;[672] until it shall again submit to the divine supremacy of Rome, and accept at its hands the doctrines of the Catholic faith. Then, and then alone, shall the schism which separates England from the body of Christ be healed, by the unifying virtue of Catholic authority. Then shall the errors and heresies of the authors of this separation be utterly dissipated by the infallible *magisterium* of the Universal Church. Then shall a new life be infused into the decaying members of the Church of England; the clergy, now without orders or jurisdiction, will be restored to their ancient dignity and power, and will display the majesty of their divine authority. We feel confident that the time is not far distant when the English Church is destined to be relieved from its misery, and recalled to its original greatness. The prodigious multiplication of errors and heresies in every part of the kingdom has already spread alarm among the English people, in whom respect for the past is emplanted by nature;

671 Lathbury: *History of the Convocation*, c. xiv., p. 372, seq.

672 See, for the British Church, an instance in the Council of Arles, *Epist. Synodi ad Silvestrum Papam*, in Labbe (Conc., t. i., p. 2449), and the Canons iv., v., vi., and vii. of the Synod of Sardica, which was also attended by British prelates. For the Anglo-Saxon Church, see the documents collected by Dr. Lingard, *Hist. and Antiq. of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, vol. i., c. iii., n. iii., pp. 113—117. London, 1845.

the restoration of long-disused observances, and the revival of ancient doctrines, have aroused Catholic feelings within the very boundaries of the Establishment; the growth of Rationalism and infidelity, which is blighting every principle of Christianity throughout England has terrified every true Christian heart; whilst the majesty of the Roman Popedom contrasted with the misery of Protestant communions—its manly strength amid storms of every description, its steadily increasing power all over the world, the veneration with which 200,000,000 men of every nation and tongue listen to its voice and submit to its orders—have awakened throughout the country a marked sympathy for Rome, and still continues to multiply the number of conversions to the Catholic Church. Dr. Pusey, with his *Vindication of Tract XC.*, and his *Eirenicon*,[673] as well as the various Protestant associations, with all their means of deception and corruption, will not, we are sure, succeed in checking this Catholic movement, which grows every day deeper and stronger, and defies every contrivance and opposition on the part of its enemies. May it reach, before long, its highest pitch, and triumph over all obstacles! Then the Church of England, replaced on the immovable rock of St. Peter, will take its noble and ancient rank in the Church of Christ, to the glory and support of the Catholic faith both in the Old World and in the New.

[673] See *The Articles treated in Tract XC. vindicated*, by Dr. Pusey, p. 153, seq. As to the *Eirenicon*, it was a very general opinion that Dr. Pusey published that book in order to prevent a large secession from the Establishment to the Roman Catholic Church.

63849